

THE
NEIGHBOR

By
Nathaniel S. Shaler

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.

*Archive
Collection*



* *
This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

Nathaniel S. Shaler.

THE NEIGHBOR. 12mo, \$1.30, *net*. Postage extra.

ELIZABETH OF ENGLAND. A Dramatic Romance. In five volumes: I. The Coronation. II. The Rival Queens. III. Armada Days. IV. Essex. V. The Passing of the Queen. 8vo, the set, \$10.00, *net*. Postage extra.

THE INTERPRETATION OF NATURE. 16mo, \$1.25.

KENTUCKY. *In the American Commonwealths Series.* With Map. 16mo, \$1.25.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE EARTH'S SURFACE. Part I. Glaciers. By N. S. Shaler and Wm. Morris Davis. Splendidly illustrated. Folio, \$10.00.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & COMPANY,
BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

THE NEIGHBOR

THE NEIGHBOR

The Natural History of Human Contacts

BY

N. S. SHALER



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1904

COPYRIGHT 1904 BY N. S. SHALER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published April, 1904

PREFACE

IN this book I have endeavored to set forth some matters concerning the intercourse of men with their neighbors which have helped me, and which I hope may be helpful to others who may desire to go beyond the commonplace relation with their fellow-men. The greater part of what I have said is, so far as the facts go, familiar knowledge; my effort has been to shape this information in such a manner that it will throw light on human relations.

What there is of novelty in this writing is mainly limited to the effect of tribal institutions and states of mind on the development of the modern commonwealth, and to the effects of the first contacts of individuals on their subsequent relations. I have endeavored to apply certain observations on those contact phenomena to two serious race problems, those presented by the intercourse of the Jews and the Negroes with the people of our own race. In so doing I have been compelled to set forth judgments

as to the character and qualities of these folk which are likely to prove offensive to some of their members. I realize that it is a serious and difficult matter to characterize races as a whole or to judge them on the basis of any experience such as can come to any one person. Where I have done this task with the Israelites and the Americanized Africans it has been done from long and patient study of those peoples. The questions as to their nature which I have discussed have been in my mind for about forty years, so that if the judgments are in error the mistakes are not due to haste.

The plan of the book has required a restatement of certain points more extendedly treated in a volume entitled, "The Individual: A Study of Life and Death," which was published two years ago. The repetition of this matter gives a certain look of similarity to these works; they are, however, essentially dissimilar. "The Individual" is an essay towards a better understanding of what the solitary condition of man means in the order of nature; this on the natural history of the neighbor endeavors to set forth some of the conditions of human contact as they are influenced by the organic education of

mankind. In effect the two pieces of work seek essentially diverse, though in a way related, ends.

Although this book is in effect a plea for a larger understanding of the differences between men, I would have the reader approach it with some sense of the significance of the questions it discusses. I ask him if it is not evident that the antecedents which determine the state of mind with which he meets an alien man are of great importance in determining his judgments concerning him. I ask him further to note that all our efforts to unite men in human associations, societies, states, and nations, depend upon the measure in which we may be able to overcome certain instinctive prejudices which grievously hinder such union of men in the common endeavors which advance mankind. If he will but see one instance of this, that of the Negro problem in the United States, a type of what has to be faced the world about, he will perceive how the question of the natural history of the neighbor lies not only at the foundation of morals, but of statecraft as well; and that we need to understand it in order to shape our commonwealth.

N. S. S.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass.,
September, 1903.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. ON THE NATURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL	1
II. ON CERTAIN CONDITIONS OF MAN	10
III. ON THE NATURE OF HATRED	21
IV. ON THE NATURE OF THE TRIBE	28
V. NATURE AND VALUE OF ETHNIC MOTIVES	51
VI. THE HEBREW PROBLEM	72
VII. THE PROBLEM OF THE AFRICAN	126
VIII. THE CATEGORIC MOTIVE IN HUMAN RELATIONS	192
IX. THE CONDITIONS OF THE CONTACTS OF MEN	204
X. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF VARIETY AND SPECIES IN ORGANIC LIFE	236
XI. THE WAY OUT	260
INDEX	337



THE NEIGHBOR

CHAPTER I

ON THE NATURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

THE subject of the inquiries which are hereinafter set forth may be shortly defined as follows. In the case of mankind, as with all other organic groups, we have a multitude of individuals all of which have to establish more or less permanent relations with their kindred of various degrees. These relations are of the utmost importance to the persons concerned in them, for they determine their lot. They are of even more moment to the life of the group to which they belong, for on them may depend its success or failure in the struggle for existence. Such relations between individuals, though they are of relatively simple nature, exist among the units of the lower inorganic realm. The atoms, molecules, crystals, and celestial spheres act and react on one another and have their profit or loss from the exchange of influences; in fact, the visible universe, so far as we know it, appears to be made up of such isolated structures, each having for its share the task of

receiving impressions from the others within the limits of environment and of sending forth its influences to all the like individualities within the range of its actions.

One of the noblest accomplishments of modern science has been to show us something of this exchange of influences which goes on in that vast realm of atomic relations. We see, though as yet but dimly, how the more or less temporary groupings of these inconceivably small units give us all the varied qualities of matter. In one order of arrangement, in any set of atoms, we have a molecule which sends forth a stream of actions that affects the realm about it in a certain manner. If we change the grouping of the association with no other alteration save that brought about by the change in the number or position of its units, the qualities it sends forth are altered, it may be in effect infinitely, so that an inconceivable variety of properties can be produced by what seems to be no more than a change of place of the constituent units. Thus by a mere shifting of the stations of the thirty atoms of carbon in a molecule of a certain kind of alcohol, species of that group may be produced in number so great as to transcend the imagination. The sum of the innovations thus originated may far exceed a million million, and each of the perturbations gives rise

ON THE NATURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL 3

to substances of new qualities, that is, to forms of matter each of which has a peculiar influence on its environment. It is evident that even in the relatively simple conditions of the atoms of a molecule, what appear to be very slight alterations in the relation of its atomic units to each other in some inevitable way alter the quality of the action which the association exercises on the individuals about it.

Great as are the effects arising from the diversities in the groupings of units in the atomic field, the value of such reciprocal influence on any part of the inorganic realm is small as compared with what it is in that of the organic. In all the living associations of matter the physical and chemical effects arising from changes in the position of the units are exhibited quite as well as they are in those which are inanimate; but in addition to the properties due to atomic and molecular conditions, we have in living things other higher and more varied qualities due to the peculiar kinds of association which come about with life. We need now to glance at these characteristics of animate individuals.

I have elsewhere and in more detail than is required for my present purpose endeavored to show that the essential difference between the living or organic and the inorganic or non-living realms con-

sists in that fact that in the organic the qualities exhibited by the individuals of any species — as, for instance, those of any particular kind of atom, molecule, or crystals — are, under the same environing conditions, always precisely alike. Thus the atoms of the farthest stars are evidently the same as those of the earth, and a crystal of quartz formed in the Archæan age, if built under like environment, in no wise differs from one we make in our laboratories. On the other hand, because they inherit their experience with environment from their ancestors and are much affected by that experience, organic individuals are in their generational succession in constant process of modification. They are ever changing as regards what they take from and give to their surroundings. This is perhaps most clearly seen when we consider the difference between the lowest living forms in the series of beings which led to mankind, and the last of the great procession, man himself. The quality of the last term, man, that is, its capacity for influencing its neighbors, of acting on and being acted on by the environing individuals, is evidently vastly different from the first. Moreover, this organic feature of inherited quality brings about changes not only from generation to generation and from species to species, but it is likely to change very much in the lifetime of each of the persons in the succession. Thus while

permanence of quality is a general feature in the inorganic realm, in the organic we find an endless flux in that quality, and a consequent variation in the influences which the individual exercises on its environment.

Although the observer may, with very little study, see enough of the order of nature to note the fact that what is done in the visible universe is, so far as we can see, accomplished by individualities of various grades from the lowest of the physical to the highest of the organic realm, it is not easy to see far enough into the matter to recognize how, as the development of the individualizing process goes on, the value of the unit steadily gains. Although the scope and variety of actions of an atom are evidently great, probably far greater than we shall ever know, they are relatively very limited as compared with those of a molecule made up of many such units, and the field of influential qualities in the lowest living form must be vastly more extended than in the case of the highest of those which are not informed by life. As we go up in the organic series, the influences which the creature receives from and sends forth to the individualities about it steadily increase. This advance is made even when the gain is in structure alone, but it becomes very much more evident in the series of animals which develop intelligence. Such

creatures receive and send forth influences in proportion to their intellectual capacity, and with each increment of that power the scope of those reactions is increased in an exceedingly rapid proportion.

The result of the system of evolving individualities of higher and higher grade attains, so far as the naturalist discerns, its summit in man. It is highly improbable that in human kind we have the actual culmination of this evidently pervading motive of advance, this most deep-seated and apparently universal impulse of the visible universe; it is, indeed, reasonable to suppose that it extends without limit throughout the realm, and that there are at least as many kinds of individuals of a higher grade as there are of a lower grade than ourselves. For our problem, however, we need consider no more than the evident fact that by a process of evolution, which, so far as we can see, is of universal application, we as men have come by successive stages of advance — leading through, perhaps, more than a hundred thousand different organic species — up to a station where we have a singular capacity of receiving from the world about us, and sending back to that world, a body of influences in range and scope immeasurably greater than those that came to or went forth from any of the lower creatures whence our life was derived.

It is difficult to conceive the extent to which man

has become the recipient and the originator of influences. We see something of the dynamic value of the creature when we behold the vast effect he has had on the physical conditions of the earth: how he has swept away forests, extirpated a host of animals, and changed the nature of the life over wide areas of its surface. In his battles with the beasts, with his fellow-men, and with the nature that opposes his desires, we see only the ruder and less important side of his power; the more important is discerned by those alone who attend to what we may term the moral side of his activities, to those actions which influence for good or ill the well-being of the fellow-creatures of his own or other kinds which share life with him. Because these effects of the individual person or of those higher personalities created where such units are merged into societies or states are not visible to the eye, they are inevitably neglected. Reflection, however, will show the student of such matters that every human being is a centre which receives an almost infinite array of moral impulses and transmits a like host to other life. If by some art we could render these movements visible, these persons would no longer seem as they now do to be solitary, little affected and little affecting things, but each would appear as a sun ruling and being ruled by a host of like orbs, receiving influ-

ences from millions of its kind and sending in return the like to each and all of its fellows.

The conception of the individual man as the present summit of a series of advancing individualities, each, in the measure of its advancement, the centre of relations with the sources from which it receives and to which it sends influences, helps us in many ways to see the moral status of our kind. It is evident that, as the result of this evolution, human beings have in effect become agencies by which energy is transformed from its lower states of manifestation, such as it exhibits in the physical realm, to the higher intellectual plane. What we do as men is accomplished by the conversion of the forces which come to us from the chemical and physical fields, where they have operated from the beginning of the present state of the universe, into action which is guided by mind. All the energy which we apply in any kind of thought is in no sense originated in the thinking; it is merely converted from the lower to the higher use. So far as we can clearly discern, this force when used commonly falls back into the lower ancient plane of activity, but there is an evident and most important remainder which does not thus return to the primal state but abides in the higher plane in the influence which the thought-guided actions have upon the conduct of other indi-

viduals. Thus, though the mere dynamic values of the apparently temporary life fall back into the lower ancient store, the qualities of that life which are really its important part remain and are sent on to direct the course of other individuals, which in turn are to shape matter and energy to the task of living.

It should be understood that the limited view just above suggested, as to the value of the individual life as a source of influence in other lives, is to be regarded as but the immediate judgment of the naturalist working within the limits of his craft, which allows him to deal with no more than the evidently visible, or that which may be directly inferred from observations of facts. He may suspect or believe that there is something other than the directing influence of the individual being that survives death, but under his limitations he cannot deal with that question. It is clear that one of these survivals is that of directing power by which, to take the most significant example, a Jewish peasant who died near two thousand years ago shapes to this day by his brief and simple life the ways of men. Thus while the naturalist's way of looking at the matter is narrow, and leaves aside a very momentous part of it, the body of fact he has to consider is of momentous importance.

CHAPTER II

ON CERTAIN CONDITIONS OF MAN

THE proportion of the influences which the individual of any species receives or sends forth varies through an almost infinite range. In the inorganic world the action of the unit under given conditions is essentially invariable, — it may be regarded as mechanical in its nature; in the organic field, at least among animals, both the reception and transmission of actions are affected by the operation of some form of intelligence. For our present purpose this intelligence may be regarded as a condition of action in which the particular deed is qualified by experience gained by the individual in its own life or that of its ancestors, and so stored in memory that it may be used to qualify the otherwise machine-like response to stimulus. Thus defined we may if we please regard the relations of the plants to their environment as intelligent, for there can be no doubt that in them there are inheritances from the experience of ancestors which are brought into the equation which determines their conduct, so that, unlike

the inorganic units such as the atom or the crystal, their individual deeds are, in a measure, determined by those of the forms through which their life was derived.

The result of the introduction of intelligence in the shape of previously inherited experience is very greatly to extend the range and scope of the interactions of individuals. So long as the reaction to impulse was mechanical, it was necessarily determined by the dynamic equations of the moment in which it took place. As soon as any form of memory entered as a factor, the result became determined by new and vastly extended conditions, and what we may in the larger sense of the word term the moral realm was entered on. In the lower life, that of plants and the invertebrate animals, the reactions to stimulus, due to inheritance and to environment, though they may be much affected by the intellectual forces, retain a certain kind of fatality, for the reason that, even where there is evidence of a strong individual will, the actions of the creature are confined to certain determined paths; so that while they are not in the true sense of the word mechanical as in the lower physical realm, they are in large measure what may be termed inevitable. With the beginning of the vertebrate group organic life enters on a series of changes, which in a tolerably continu-

ous manner serves to elevate and aggrandize the intellectual value of the individual, leading, in various branches of the type, to a number of considerable successes, and in man, to the supreme accomplishment which this planet is to attain.

The peculiar success of the vertebrate animals appears to be due to two important structural features, which are characteristic of the group, and constitute important departures from the preceding lower plans or systems of architecture in this kingdom. First, or at least the most evident, of these, is that the jointed skeleton, which in all the lower groups is effectively external, in the invertebrates is to be internal. The result of this change is that those hard parts which enable the creature to be supported and to apply muscular force, do not have to be shed from time to time in the process of growth, as is the case with the crustaceans and the insects, so that the creature can steadfastly increase in size while remaining continuously active. With the articulated animals, on the contrary, the process of shedding the external hard parts makes it necessary for them to be for a time without the protection and support which they require for their activities. The result of this is that while the crustaceans and the kindred forms are in most ways supremely fortunate animals, they are denied the chance of dominance

by the fact that their skeletons have from time to time to be cast away, which makes it impossible for them to attain any considerable bulk. How effective this limitation has been may be judged by the evident fact that the average weight of mature insects is certainly less than one ten-thousandth that of adult vertebrates.

The other peculiarity of the vertebrates is closely related to the constitution of the vertebrated skeleton, for it led to the institution of that structure; it consists in the invention of a special tract, that of the spinal cord, and later the brain, which is effectively an addition to that series of parts existing in the invertebrate group. In those lowlier forms all the work of receiving impressions from without and reacting on them, as well as the control of the functions of the various parts of the body, is effected in the simplest forms, such as the protozoa, by the diffused nervous capacity which primarily exists in organic matter; higher up in the several advancing series there develop sets of nerves and ganglia, all tied together in structure, so that the intellectual and organic work are done by the same parts. The essential peculiarity of the cerebro-spinal or vertebrate nervous system is that, while it in some measure serves to direct the work of the body, its principal function is to receive impressions from

without, and to act as the seat of the intelligence. It is, as regards the most important work, a bureau of foreign affairs, and as such is the seat of the intellectual powers of the creature.

In its initial stage the nervous system characteristic of the vertebrates is no more than a simple nerve supported by what is at first but a cartilaginous rod, which is channeled to receive the nerve. From this primitive simplicity of the Chordata, well shown by the lancelet, the advance towards the characteristic skeletal arrangements of the higher back-boned animals is made with singular speed, and as if to appointed ends. What was a mere supporting rod soon incloses the spinal cord; it hardens, becomes jointed in the characteristic manner of the back-bone, and develops the specialized head, or casing, for the enlargement of the tract which forms the brain. From the joints of the vertebræ double processes which are to become the ribs extend downwards along the sides of the trunk; and others, single, grow upwards to form the spines of the several segments. The whole is quickly shaped so as to serve as an elastic framework by which the muscles can swing the afterpart of the body in the sculling motion by which most fishes swim. This is the first and in the fish stage the only important use of the jointed skeleton which has its beginning

in that group. In the later developments it ceases to have value, yet even among the higher mammals the ancient habit of swinging the afterpart of the body in the sculling movement remains, though it serves, as in the dog, only as a means of expressing a pleasurable sense of activity.

In the ichthyc or earliest stage of the vertebrate skeleton, while the only method in which progression could be accomplished was by the swinging tail, the fore and hind limbs which were ever afterwards to control the ways of vertebrate life began to form. At first these structures, essentially fins, are so slight and inefficient that it is unreasonable to attribute their development to the process of natural selection. At best they serve only as balancing organs, in some measure preventing the rolling motion of the body which the strokes of the tail may tend to produce. Those who know living fishes well are likely to agree with me in the opinion that these paired fins have no such functional value as would by selective action lead to their development. Yet there is an absolute justification for their existence in that they are the beginnings of the fore and hind limbs of all the higher vertebrates. Those parts which have so far determined the bodies and minds of the series of amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals, are in the end the inheritance of man.

It is not our task to consider how the fins of the fishes came to be, or in what manner the limbs of the higher classes of the type were developed from these lowly beginnings. For our purpose we need only to note that the conditions under which these structures arose in the first steps of the vertebrates determined that there should never be more than four of these instruments which the general skeleton affords for the uses of the will. Here and there these limbs are supplemented by the jaws, or by elongations of the lips, as in the elephant; by horns or antlers, as in the ruminants and some other brutes; but for all the higher work of the will the vertebrate is limited to very few parts that are of any efficiency.

The result of the curious limitation in the parts which are subservient to the will of the vertebrate is to lessen the value of inherited experience in their actions, and correspondingly to increase that of individual thought. In the bees and ants, on the one hand, where the bodily parts are so arranged that they afford apparatus accurately fitted for all the needs of their wills, the result is that the mind operates in the automatic manner which we term instinctive, where, though the action is other than mechanical for the reason that it is guided by a mode of memory, it is narrowly limited as are the deeds

which we do in what is called an automatic way, as the child sucks the mother, or as the eyelids close when the eye is threatened. On the other hand, in the vertebrates, though there is something of the mechanically operating instincts, the creature is continually being led by the limitations of its frame unconsciously to contrive means for attaining its ends. We see the effect of this need in all the series of this type; in the nest-building fishes; in the amphibians; in certain reptiles; extensively in the birds; but most abundantly in the mammals, where the struggle of the will with imperfect instruments culminates in the developed intelligence of man,—an intelligence which has been forced towards the human quality by the need of doing much with the pair of hands that alone serve the behests of the will. In a word, if man had been as amply provided with instruments suited to his needs as is the bee, there is reason to believe that the quality of his intelligence would have been no more rational than that of the insects. He has, indeed, won to his high estate because with a vigorous nervous system and corresponding will his ancestry denied him other than the most limited instruments for accomplishing his desires.

While the physical conditions which led to man have served in large part to lift his intellect above

the plane of instinct and give it the quality of rationality, the quality that reckons and judges, the result has by no means been to extinguish the ancient instinctive motives. In effect, the rational groups of motives have been superadded to the more ancient unconscious or emotional kinds of mind, with the result that in the higher groups of mammals, and especially in the human genus, the impulses which blindly lead to action are about as strong though perhaps less definite than they are in the insects. They appear to be more varied than in any invertebrates, perhaps for the reason that they are all in some measure qualified by the higher intelligence. Thus we recognize in man all the motives we find exhibited in the bees; love of offspring, of the fellow-members of his society, the greed of acquisition, fear of enemies, rage, valor, in a word all of those motives that are manifested by social insects of the militant type. What other impulses apparently of the instinctive order we may discern in our genus can be accounted for by the coöperation of the higher intelligence with the lower. Thus the motive of personal sympathy with the fellow of the species, which is found in some measure among very many of the birds and mammals and is especially characteristic of well-developed human beings, but which apparently does not exist among the insects or other

invertebrates, is not in its nature primal but secondary; it grows out of the intellectual capacity to recognize the essential kinship with the brother, which makes it possible to picture his sufferings as our own.

We have come now to the purpose of this seeming digression concerning the origin of man's intelligence: it is that we may see even in the baldest outlines how it has come about that in man we have a mingling of the ancient primal form of intelligence which acts without consciousness, and is blindly moved by the form of mental impulse we term instinctive, and the higher rational quality which appears to be limited to the vertebrates alone. Even those who are least skilled in the analysis of their motives can clearly see how these two groups of mental actions are combined in deeds. The inherited hatreds, sympathies, and affections which are the basis of human relations are of the ancient pre-human order, but the conduct of life which gives them efficiency is of the new, for it is guided by the constructive imagination, by the reason, and by knowledge acquired in the lifetime of the individual. It is the first object of education and the noblest result of civilizing culture to bring these two groups of mental parts into a fit coördination so that they together make the enlarged humanized man. It

is hardly too much to say that all the important errors of conduct, all the burdens of men or of societies are caused by the inadequacies in the association of the primal animal emotions with those mental powers which have been so rapidly developed in mankind.

CHAPTER III

ON THE NATURE OF HATRED

WHEN we examine into those inherited motives of man derived from the life far below the human plane, we find among the foremost, second only to hunger in its intensity and constancy, that of hatred. Sexual passion is perhaps more intense ; but among most brutes it is developed only at certain seasons, while the impulse of hate is ever ready to control activities and is quickened by slight accidents. This emotion is evident in all the invertebrates which exhibit any distinct mental capacity. It is exhibited in the crustaceans, in the spiders, and the true insects, as well as in the cephalopod mollusks. In the vertebrate series it is apparently universal, no well observed species failing to show some trace of it. It is evidently a concomitant of activity, developing in every form that reacts vigorously on its environment, and in some proportion to the energy of that reaction. In man, the most intensely reactive of all creatures, the one that receives the most from the outer world and sends the most back to it,

the motive of hatred is evidently the most vigorous and wide-ranging that we find in the animal kingdom. In him the impulse is excited by more varied conditions, and plays a larger part in the conduct of the creature than in any of the lower forms.

To understand how the large development of the motive of hatred in man has come about we need to look to the conditions of animal activity in the lower groups, especially those which are in or near the series of forms where the primitive elements of human quality were shaped. A glance at this wide field shows us that wherever the desires of any creature become vigorous the will which seeks to enforce them attains a proportionate intensity. The individual throws itself against its environment and the unending game of chase and flight begins. As in ourselves, the effort to capture or to escape commands the utmost of the mental powers, and the state of mind induced by this activity is the simplest form of hatred. In mankind, the motive may, and commonly does, become more or less complicated with the rational powers; even in the lower life it may be mingled with other instincts such as fear, but in its simplest expression it is the impulse which leads to slaying, be it to gratify hunger, to overcome the sexual rival, or to avoid the pursuer. In one or another of these modes it is effectively a

permanent motive ; in all the vertebrate series it is embodied in their mental activities during the whole of their waking lives, — when they dream it appears, as in our dogs and barnyard fowl, to be present as it is in ourselves.

The result of the long education in hatred which man brought with him from the lower life to his human station was to start him in the work of that higher plane with that motive singularly developed. The gain in rational power led him to perceive more clearly than his brutal ancestors how nearly all that went on about him was inimical to his desires. His fellow-men were his rivals, the beasts he sought to capture his foes. Soon the natural forces, so far as they were harmful, were rationally conceived as due to the will of unseen beings which contended against him ; so it comes about that the primitive man is a Philistine with his hand by birthright set against his neighbor of all degrees, animate and inanimate. He must slay when he can and propitiate when he cannot slay, and all with hatred in his heart. If there had been no corrective of this evil state man would have been but one more beast in the world, keener witted and more effective than any of his ancestors, yet but another beast. But there came to him with the impulses of the brute the beginnings of another emotion, the sympathetic, which was destined greatly

to modify that of hatred, and in time to qualify many of the instincts which were sent up to him from the lower life. Although there is much that we naturally cannot explain in the development of the sympathies, a certain and very important part of their history is clearly to be discerned. This, briefly stated, is as follows.

In the lower life of vertebrates that exhibit any distinct motives, the mother shows, and sometimes both parents show, a love of offspring. However much we may doubt the efficiency of natural selection in shaping the development of animals, it is hardly to be questioned that as regards this instinct of parental love it has been most efficient; for those stocks which were by that emotion led to take the greatest care of their young would as a matter of course have had a decidedly better chance of survival than others which in any measure lacked that motive. It is probably not by this process that the impulse of self-devotion of parents was first instituted, but the intensification of it was probably thus brought about in all the series which attain to any high degree of intelligence. When the care of the progeny is distributed over a host of eggs, as in the case of most of the fishes, the affection is of an inadequate nature and can hardly be classed with the sympathies. When, however, in the succession which leads to man, the young are

not only born alive but come normally but one at each gestation, the attention of the mother is fixed upon the child with the result that it becomes the object of intense love. We see something of the effect of this limitation in our domesticated animals. A cow or a mare is greatly distressed if parted from its calf or foal, yet a sow, though belonging to a species which appears to be endowed with much more lively sympathies, cares relatively little for its offspring; it does not note the loss of any one of its large brood, and exhibits little sorrow if all of them are taken away.

The extremely imperfect state of the human infant at time of birth demands from the mother an amount of care and devotion which serves yet further to extend the love of it which other conditions have served to implant. For about two years the child engrosses the attention of the parents so that the habit of affection becomes so well affirmed that it is likely to continue till death ends the relation. Moreover the development of the monogamic habit has served to bring about a love of the father for the child, which in the more advanced races attains near to that which the mother feels. Even before monogamy was instituted, as soon, indeed, as any kind of marriage was established, this love of the sire for his progeny — the peculiar affection of man

— was often strongly developed ; so that the human family appears to have been of a higher type than that of any of the lower animals since the beginning of man's estate.

Out of the assemblage of conditions which have been all too briefly set forth came the first stage of the sympathetic development which has lifted our kind morally above the plane of the brutes. Beginning with the love of parents for their children, sympathy with the fellow-being was readily extended ; first to the remoter kindred, to known kinsmen, then to those of more distant yet evident consanguinity ; at a later stage still further to all the members of the tribe or people which tradition declared of common blood. Although this extension appears to have been brought about by the spontaneous development of the sympathy with the fellow-being which arose from parental relations, the process was qualified by the intellectual motives. Curious ideas as to the bond of common blood, as well as the idea of protection from tribal gods, served to give rational support to the essentially instinctive enlargement of the motive. To the stage of the sympathetic relations which we may term tribal, all the races of man appear readily to attain. It is doubtful, indeed, if there be any peoples that have not won thus far on the way of enlargement. But

here they all tend to halt; all indeed save the very few elect of the host have gone no further, that point being evidently the furthest to which they are able to attain in their normal moral development.

CHAPTER IV

ON THE NATURE OF THE TRIBE

THE fact that in all the several species of men the tribal stage of sympathetic growth is readily attained, that in which all within the group are regarded as friends while all without are enemies, and that very few peoples go further in the enlargement, is of the utmost importance to our inquiry. I shall therefore have to consider the meaning of the matter with some care, and in this consideration ask the help of the reader, such as he will be able to give from his own experience. All that he will be called on to grant are such facts as occur in the common life of men.

First let us note what comes to mind when we think of those who are near to us. It is evident that at the beginning of our thought we picture them in our imagination as essentially like ourselves with certain slight variations in the direction of what we would be or would have them be. The most essential point we discern here is that the other person is conceived in terms of our experience with our

own personality. If this be not evident to the reader let him suppose that in some manner it came to his knowledge that his kinsman, for all the seeming likeness to himself, for all the reactions which appear to prove the identities of spiritual movement, was in fact utterly different in motive, so that while the contacts were certain always to afford a perfect accord, the essential nature of the creature was as different from his own as it would be if the other were an unconscious automaton. We readily perceive that with the coming of this knowledge all trace of sympathy would disappear and an instinctive dislike would take its place. The true basis for the affection which commonly exists between kindred is not, in modern life at least, based on any distinct idea of common blood, but on the actual or supposed likeness in mental quality. We expect to find in them qualities nearer to our own than we would be likely to discover in strangers.

Passing from the experience we have with those who are very near to us and with whom our sympathetic relations are normally active, let us note what takes place when we enter on relations with strangers. The steps by which we make this approach to the unknown fellow-man are so familiar that they have the quality of the commonplace and as such do not exhibit themselves to consciousness.

Yet if we attentively watch we find, first of all, that the person is of our species. The process by which this determination is made is really quite complex though it appears to be perfectly simple. The complexity can only be judged by those rare instances in which we may have trouble in finding in an object sufficient evidence to show whether it be a man or no. I recall an experience which served in a clear way to show me the manner in which the mind works when it seeks to determine that a particular object is or is not an individual of our kind. I was walking on a foggy morning across the open country on the western side of the crater-lake known as Lago di Bolsena in Tuscany; before me I saw at some distance an unclassifiable creature which looked like a cow walking on its hind legs. The first impression made on my mind was one of intense curiosity mingled with a distinct sense of fear,—the ancient human and animal dread of all living things that transcend experience. It was some minutes before I came near enough to the thing to find that it was a man clad in a cow's hide, the skin of the hind legs covering his lower limbs, that of the fore legs his arms, while that of the beast's head served him as a cap. The instantaneous change in my state of mind when the human nature of the object became evident was to

me a revelation concerning the familiar process of recognizing a fellow of our species. The most interesting point was the very sudden way in which the sympathies which enter into human intercourse came into activity when the process of classification was accomplished. By this accident I was brought to see that to our contacts with others of our kind we instinctively and unconsciously bring a great store of expectations and understandings as well as of sympathies or hatreds which serve as the basis of the relations to be established with them.

Some of my readers may have had similar and almost as illustrative experiences as that above described. Those who have shared in military campaigns may have fallen on the common chance of finding on the roadside what seems to be the dead body of a man, yet on close examination life proves to be in it. Now the state of mind with which we come into contact with the dead differs widely from that we bring to our relations with the living, however near death they may be. In such experiences as these we have a chance to see something of the mental conditions of our intercourse with the neighbor. In yet other shape the matter is presented by our effort to enter into relations with persons who in one way or another fail to give us tokens of likeness which we instinctively demand from those

we assume to be like ourselves. Thus all sorely wounded or very ill people are repugnant to persons of undisciplined sympathies ; so, too, are the drunken or insane. Even the much deformed afford at the moment of contact an impression which is sharply contrasted with that we receive from normal human beings. Just here let me note, what I shall further consider below, that the revolt we feel at the sight of a man who is grievously wounded, or has any sore affliction which makes him appear abnormal, passes away as soon as we lay a helpful hand on his body. Something of this dissipation of the instinctive prejudice to the apparently inhuman nature of the neighbor will take place when a person of well-trained sympathies and the imagination that makes them serviceable, vigorously goes forth to the sufferer by an exercise of the will ; but the effect is feeble as compared with that which comes from the touch of hand, that blessed touch which awakens the sense of kinship as nothing else does.

The effect which we experience when with our hands we seek to help a sufferer is for our purpose so important that I must again refer to my personal experience for illustration. By nature I am led to flee from the sight of a seriously wounded man or any other who appears unnatural. The impulse is evidently primitive, for it endures still and is as in-

tense as it was in my childhood, when it led me more than once to well-remembered shame. I recall when I was about twelve years old that a surgeon in a case of immediate need so insisted that I should help him in a gruesome case that I dared not run away. The fear that I had of approaching the sufferer is yet distinct, although it was fifty years ago; so, too, the wonder that came over me when I found that as soon as I touched him he became dear to me. Since then the good and evil chances of life have brought me beside very many wounded people, always to experience the same revolt at the sight of them and the same sense of the brother at the touch of hand. I have found that many of my friends have had a like experience. The meaning of it seems to be as follows. In the stages of the life we inherit which were passed in the numerous species, probably several hundred, between the beginning of the quadrumanous mammals and the human grade, the creatures who were shaping our instincts were accustomed to gain the most of their information by the sense of touch. At the very beginning of the *Quadrumana*, and as their most characteristic feature, we find that the ancient narrow-rending claw, characteristic of the other mammals, changes to the thin broad finger-nail, the object of the change evidently being to afford support and protection for the

pads of the finger tips, which serve as instruments of touch. Through all the ape-like species, the collateral kindred of man and sharers with him in the larger part of his education, we note that the eyes and ears afford information enough to arouse fear or its companion curiosity, but in general not enough to move the sympathies. Their affections are excited by caresses; they evidently found their way to human-like movements of the spirit by the touch of the hand.

Although in that very brief part of our life which we reckon as human many of our motives have been in some measure changed, the primal impulses, as regards the conditions of their excitation, have altered in no important way. The currents of our fears, loves, hatreds, and other streams of instinct flow in the ancient deeply carved channels which the ages of life of our prehuman ancestors have worn. So it is that while in the use of sight we have won as men wide fields for the rational work, the older instincts have been little changed by the knowledge we have thus gained. The human mother's love for the babe is, like that of the ape, mainly developed by fondling it and not by the mere sight of its body. It is true that in a secondary way sight helps us to form an image of suffering which may excite the sympathies, but this is a roundabout and imperfect

process. We may look upon a host of wounded on a battlefield with horror, but with little instinctive sense of their woe, while we feel for the one in hand as for ourselves.

While sight alone does not to any considerable extent excite sympathy, at least in a direct way, hearing has through our inheritances considerable value in this regard. In all the vertebrate series from the fishes to man the creatures which have shaped our spirit have called to one another to tell of their joy and pain, to keep in touch, to claim succor, or to give warning of danger if it were only by the cry of death. We may assume that while the mere sight of suffering is not of much moving influence on other than those whose sympathies are highly developed and well linked with the reason, the wails of suffering people are moving to all men. There is little doubt that the movement of the spirit, if in our kind, is of essentially the same nature as it is in the lower Mammalia, where the cries of the species are most exciting to all the members of the kind. With the exception of the solitary predaceous forms and those quite incapable of defense, the wail of the afflicted normally awakens the sympathies of the kindred.

The foregoing considerations help us to see some of the circumstances which determine our contact

with the fellow-man. It is evident that the conditions of human contact are in certain ways different from those which exist in the lower animals. We make the most of the judgment which begins intercourse with the stranger by means of the eyes, though for the reasons given above sight does not tend to arouse the sympathies. Next we trust to the sounds of the voice, but that instrument, originally expressive of the sympathies, has come to be in its ordinary use a mere vehicle for the rational powers. We do not, for good and ancient reasons, come into that bodily contact with the others of our kind such as in the lower animals affords the quickest means of bringing about the sense of fellowship. The result is that the individual man, inevitably a solitary being because of his individuality, is by his modes of intercourse far more cut off from the fellows of his species in all that relates to the sympathies than any other creature of high estate. He has formed a set of habits and customs which brings his first contacts with his neighbors into a rational field from which the ancient motives of affection are to a great extent excluded.

The difficulty of the situation of men as regards contact with the others of their species is still further enhanced by speech and clothing. It is a fact, one that the reader has most likely had occasion to

note, that the barrier of language puts a curious limitation on the sympathies. The fact that we accost a man in our mother tongue and are not understood, at once checks whatever share of friendly emotion began to go forth to him when we sought his acquaintance. Even when the difference in speech is no more than dialectic, there is a sense of shock of the same order as that we receive when the language is without meaning to us. The barrier is less considerable if the speech-forms have been endeared to us by literature as in the case of the Lowland Scotch, or when it is amusing, as that of the Somersetshire man, the Cockney, or the Irish. In such cases the interest comes in a way to favor sympathy, yet the sense of barrier remains to show that we instinctively demand that the stranger be like ourselves.

There is yet another demand which we spontaneously and universally make of the stranger; this is that the mental steps by which he approaches us shall be essentially like those we take in approaching him. This process of mutual introduction by certain gradations of action may be observed in the higher brutes as well as in man, being particularly conspicuous in well-bred dogs, but noticeable in all the mammalian groups. There are, indeed, certain forms which among mammals apparently have to be observed in order to pave the

way to friendly intercourse, and the habit of using them seems to be acquired. Thus while puppies will boisterously approach one another and at once proceed to romp, adult dogs begin with certain deliberate inquiries which seem to have the value of customs. It is only after a time then that they become evidently friendly. Moreover, there appears often, in the canine species at least, a distinct sense of the station of their fellows. An adult dog whose conduct has become ordered by association with the cultivated members of his kind will not assail a puppy, however he may be irritated by his familiarities. In several instances, I have observed that, while in their prime, dogs will not resent the invasions of their rights by the aged of their kind as they would certainly do if the trespass were committed by one of fighting age. Thus an old dog may without molestation range the premises guarded by other dogs, taking food where he can find it, whereas if he were of fighting age he would have to battle continuously. The facts point to the conclusion that these instinctively founded conditions of approach to the fellows of the species long antedate the coming of man, and that his formula was not altogether shaped in the human plane, though it has been made very much more extensive and complicated than in any of the lower species.

Watching the conditions of introduction of one man to another, we quickly see that the process is not the simple thing that it seems to be; it is, however, difficult to perceive its full complexity. In all first contacts there is some element of suspicion of the unknown being. It is one of the good results of the civilized order to minimize this doubt as to the other man, and in the best conditions of society it remains a mere shadow which it is hard to discern. But in the early brutal state of our series, as in the plane of the brutes, the stranger was fitly the object of suspicion; for the reasonable, the only safe presumption was that he was an enemy. It was necessary to ascertain his state of mind before disarming. In these primitive conditions the points to be determined were simple; in effect, no more was needed save to know whether the stranger was friendly or hostile. With the development of valued traditions the question of whether he worshiped the same gods and had the same rules of life became as important as his momentary state of mind. In other words, the first effect of the human quality is to introduce a wide range of more or less rational considerations into the equation which determines the relations with the neighbor. These limitations become habitual, so that the hatreds due to differences in religion, etc., become effectively as instinctive as

those due to such diversities of odor as exist in the case of hounds and foxes.

The foregoing view of the wide field of human relations — though but a glance at a vast tangle of facts — will make it easier to understand how it has come about that, in all the manifold varieties of man, the extension of sympathetic relations, at first and for a certain distance very easily attained, quickly reaches a point beyond which all the culture of the enlightened ages accomplishes but a very slow advance. The point first to be noted is that we seek in the neighbor ourselves; whether we discern this identity in the fellow-man, in petted animals, in dolls, or idols, or in unseen gods, it does not matter. It is the likeness to ourselves that awakens sympathy and affords the basis of intercourse. With the creatures below the human plane the tests of identity were few in number; general features of shape, odor, even sounds or expressive attitudes and grimaces, served as criteria for judgment as to essential likeness or diversity. With man comes in a host of other more rational bases of criticism, especially those dependent on speech, dress, and beliefs that guide conduct. As these criteria of kinship increase in number and in value as instincts, the point is quickly attained where the evident diversities found in the stranger make it commonly im-

possible to regard him as near enough to ourselves to be sympathized with. Being a competitor and unprotected by friendliness, he is naturally an object of dislike; indeed, of that quick and effective hatred which has been the condition of success in the militant species through all the long schooling man has had in the life of the brutes and of brutal men.

In a general way, the stage where — with the increasing complexity of human nature and what it required of the fellow-man — the sympathies ceased to prevail over the hatreds, affords the bounds of the ethnic group. In most cases, all within the bounds are held to be of common blood. In all instances they worship the same gods, have thereby like rules of conduct, and speak the same language. Under these conditions the ways of sympathy are kept open. Within the tribal pale the tendency is to knit firmer the bonds between man and man. If the people be able they are certain to accumulate traditions. These take shape in literature, or in formulas of religion or other activities which may become the moral and intellectual life-blood of the folk, maintaining their life in its pristine quality, as in the case of the Jews through ages of trial, and making their extirpation almost impossible. No one can look upon the characteristic tribal or ethnic group without feeling that in it we have the most

characteristic and in many ways the noblest of all the accomplished works of man. Our states and civilizations may in time attain to greater splendor, but they are as yet unorganized and ephemeral things compared with those primitive constructions.

As soon as an ethnic society is organized it takes on many of the characteristics of the primitive animal individual, it lives for itself alone. Other groups of like nature are its enemies to whom no faith of any kind is owed. To plunder them is not theft, to slay those who are of them is not murder, they are outside the pale of all obligations whatever. The more intense the common life of the ethnic group, the more faithful its members to one another and the more faithless they are apt to be towards all who are not of their society. Thus among the ancient Jews, where the concepts of faith within the tribe were of the highest attained by man, there was, until a late stage of development, no idea of duty to the alien because he was a man. As such, he possessed no rights whatever.

It is evident that the greatest obstacle which has retarded the advance of all races is the inevitable limitation of the sympathies which the ethnic pale imposes. Thus among the Jews, where the intellectual and moral impulses attained a higher and more enduring development than among any other peo-

ple, there is no trace of a sense of duty to the extra-tribal neighbor until the prophet Jonah, and no distinct enunciation of the doctrine that all men are brothers until it came from Christ.

Although the ethnic motive is most distinctly manifested in the primitive tribe, where common blood, religion, language, and customs exist, and has accomplished its most characteristic work in those compact associations, it is to be observed at large in less distinct forms among all human societies. It may take the form of social rank, of caste, of religious distinctions; it is, in fact, an isolating motive native to man which is continually seeking expression. Throughout all the lands I have traversed on foot, including the greater part of Europe, I have found evidences of it in the states of mind of peoples even of the same stock who are parted from one another by dialects, by religion, or even by slight geographic barriers. Thus in German-speaking Switzerland, certain Roman Catholic and Protestant parishes hold sympathetically aloof; and in Italy I often found the peoples of neighboring valleys, who were parted by nothing more significant than a mountain barrier, each regarding the other with a curious suspicion and hatred. On the other hand, the most significant peculiarity of the American people, that which in my opinion sets them more apart from the

rest of the world than any other, is the relative absence of the tribe-forming motive among them. While in Europe there is a general tendency to disbelieve in all men, even of the same race, who are not well-known, — a humor which is least, but still discernible, in Great Britain, and increases to the lands about the Mediterranean, — in the United States there is hardly more than a trace of this humor, and that appears to be steadily lessening. In general, the American is characterized by an almost unreasonable belief in the likeness to himself of the neighbor, however far parted by race, speech, or creed. This is so strong that even the Civil War did not shake it; it served rather to affirm the mutual confidence. Yet, as I shall note hereafter, there are certain places in which the impulse distinctly appears, in a manner to show that no people have escaped this ancient tribe-making motive.

Looking at all the instances in which the tribal motive has come nearest to extinction, we find them first, as above remarked, in the American Union, and next, curiously enough, among the diverse peoples who have been converted to the Mahometan religion. In the American instance the result may be attributable to a widespread common education, much travel, and to the traditions of democracy, all combined with an informal Christianity, which de-

spite its great variety of tenets holds fairly well to the leading doctrine of Christ, that of the brotherhood of man. It is not easy to conjecture how Mahometanism has served to break down the ethnic barriers among the peoples which have become subjected to it. It is evident that the folk who have adopted that belief are, as a whole, of a temper and in a state inclining them to be extremely tribal; yet some quality of their faith brings them to recognize the man of the other tribe who holds to it as a brother far more effectively than Christianity has ever done, though in the purpose of its founder this was the main feature of his creed. Speaking under correction, for I know nothing of Islam from near view, it seems to me that the end is most likely attained by the intensity of the monotheism of that faith. Given the idea of one god and his one supreme prophet preaching the fellowship of man, there is a convincing value in the belief which seems to be strong enough to prevail over the walls of the tribe high and strong as they may be. The like identifying power should exist in Judaism, for all within the faith are brethren, though their god is the god solely of their own ethnic group. Yet in spirit they are as opposed to proselyting as the Mahometans are in favor of it, so they lost their chance of mastering the world which their kindred in race and faith so nearly attained.

As for the failure of Christianity to break down ethnic barriers, though that was the foremost object of its founder, the reasons seem complex, perhaps not all yet plain to us. It seems to me evident that the foremost reason is to be found in the change of motives which came through the diversion of the Church from the purposes of its founder, whereby it was converted into what is essentially a polytheism, and in the centering of the attention on personal salvation. All these unhappy consequences appear to have been primarily due to the intermingling of mystical Greek philosophy with the clear and simple teachings of Jesus. Be the cause what it may, the lamentable fact is that the religion which more than all others should have been effective in lessening the evils of the tribal spirit has been most impotent in that work. So far from having lessened the evils due to the tribal motive, it, until modern times, served to aggravate them. Even in these days when the general advance of civilization has done much to widen sympathies, we find the advance in no considerable measure furthered by the religion which, more than all others, should have led in the on-going.

While we have to condemn the tribal spirit as in high measure harmful to the larger interests of man,

we should not overlook the fact that in all cases it has afforded the beginnings of commonwealths. The only possible way of forming a social unit larger than the immediate family was by an enlargement of the idea of kinship on which the family rests. The only way in which the nascent tribe could have gained motives which would have made it strong enough to resist the impact of the disintegrating forces of the savagery in which it originated, was by means of all the bonds of common faith and form that could be given to it. The dislike of unrelated men which remained after the tribe was knit together was no new evil, but the remnant of the hatred with which the primitive men regarded their fellows. In its fit time the tribe was an oasis in the desert of unsympathetic greed that encompassed the lonely pioneers of the work of men. It was not until by means of the tribal organization men were lifted to the concepts of order, mutual sacrifice, and action continuing from generation to generation that it was possible to go further in the process of development. The doctrine of Christ would have been out of place in the time when the tribal organization was as incoherent and ill-affirmed as is our existing system of the commonwealth. It was not until the ethnic unit had shown how good it was for brethren to dwell together in unity that the time came for the larger

associations based on the recognition of the real kinship of man.

There is yet another limitation which must be made in the criticism and condemnation of the ethnic motive, which it is the fashion of our time to make. In the highly organized tribes we find, as in those of Israel, an organic intensity and a moral control of its elements such as has never been won and is probably not winnable in any wider commonwealth which has been established. It is evident that when the concepts of common blood and faith are put aside the bond that unites men is thereby enfeebled. Those of us who believe in the commonwealth trust to certain enlargements of the sympathies, and of knowledge that will support them, to give us safety. But we draw upon our confidence in the nature of man rather than on history for our justification. Thus, while the tribal motive is a distinct barrier to the higher processes of civilization, it not only has made that stage of development possible but it still remains the most complete success that man has yet attained in the field of social development.

It is also to be noted that the formal concept of the tribal state, which is that those of common blood alone are fit for the common work of a society, still remains as a postulate that cannot lightly be dismissed. We hope to see a common-

wealth so organized that all sorts and conditions of men may find shelter under a roof as wide as the sky. I, for one, have enduring confidence in the possibility of such an order, yet I have to confess that the judgment is based on a reckoning of human quality, and finds as yet insufficient support in experience. It is to be wrought out from the existing basis of ethnic motives and will have to be shaped by the enlargement of the accomplishments of that form of human endeavors. The process by which the larger commonwealth of man is being evolved from the lesser is beset by difficulties. As in evolution of a new organic adjustment, the species which afford the steps for the transition are temporary and endure but briefly, thus seeming to be failures, so in this social progress the steps are tentative and often apparently unsuccessful, but the naturalist trusts them to lead to a great accomplishment.

We are now in danger of underestimating the importance of those differences between groups of men on which the tribal system rested. We are assuming that in a state of the modern type we may effect the same close relation between people of diverse stocks that is brought about in a true ethnic group. In other words, we are endeavoring to build states which shall be no more than enlarged tribes, and we seek to accomplish this suppression of the race or ethnic

motive in a violent manner, though with a semblance of law. I shall endeavor to show the fallacy of this method, and something of its unhappy consequences, in considering the problem of the relations between the Negroes and Indians and the whites of North America. For our present purpose it is enough to note that there is danger in overlooking the obduracy of the ethnic motive which is very deeply implanted in man, being one of the most important instincts which came to him from the lower life. The worst failures in organizing modern states have arisen from the belief that the tribal motives of isolation were due to mere obstinacy, that they could be easily crushed out, and that the people who were moved by them might straightway be provided with a brand-new array of motives which had been evolved by their masters. It would be quite as reasonable and merciful to seek a change in the color of men's hides by a process of flaying with a view to implanting a new skin.

CHAPTER V

NATURE AND VALUE OF ETHNIC MOTIVES

THE question now before us is to determine the nature and value of those prejudices and prepossessions which affect the relations of diverse peoples with one another. It requires but a glance at the existing conditions of men to show us that this matter is of great importance. In fact, as reasonable men, knowing as we do the efficiency of scientific methods in affording a basis for duty in the conduct of life, we cannot justly go further with our tasks of government without trying to understand what it means that the tribes and races we are endeavoring to bring together and merge in harmonious commonwealths fail to come into accord. I shall, therefore, seek in the manner of the naturalist to find what the facts are, and then to see what guidance may be had from them. The first step will be to note many of the past and present features of the relations between races and tribes which have been forced to dwell together and in some measure to share the life of a commonwealth; then to examine

into the meaning of the tribal system so far as it relates to association of such groups of men in larger societies ; and finally to consider in the light of our knowledge what should be the organization of a state based on an understanding of the innate social motives of its various elements.

The first point to note is that the natural, indeed, the inevitable, social order is that of the tribe, the enlarged family, and that in this state of organization the greater part of the life of man has been passed. It may now be assumed as certain that men have been in existence for some hundred thousand years. We have no clear evidence as to the conditions of their association for more than six or eight thousand years, but the generality of the tribal system indicates that they were at a very early stage in their advance divided into separate groups, each with all of its members in friendly relations with one another, while the individual groups were in a state of isolation and more or less hostile to every other. Thus we may assume that after some kind of family relation that of the tribe is the oldest social feature of mankind. It evidently fits all the diverse species of our genus and has been firmly implanted by experience. Moreover, the tribal habit of man is not an invention made by him. It evidently was inherited from his ancestors of the lower

life, for among all the Quadrumana clearly to be reckoned his collateral but near organic and psychic kinsmen, this social habit prevails. The creatures usually dwell in groups which are evidently held together by a sympathetic bond, and are in more or less hostile relation to other groups of the same or diverse species, so that we may regard the tribal motive as even more affirmed than it could have been by human experience.

The next point to note is that the development of the militant spirit and the superior power of certain tribes leads to conquests of other like units. So far as we can judge by what we see in existing low-grade peoples the usual fate of the conquered was to be exterminated. At a later stage some part of the defeated tribes, if not of a stock so remote as to arouse race prejudices by great differences in appearance, were adopted by the conquerors. Yet later came the institution of slavery, when the captives were regarded as domesticated animals with no human rights. Still further on, when the idea of domination became more developed, conquered tribes were allowed to exist as subjugated peoples for the profit of their masters. At this stage the Roman and mediæval type of state made up of one mastering folk and a number of subjugated tribes or states took definite shape. Such associations had existed

from the dawn of history and doubtless in unrecorded time, but the deliberate effort to organize something like commonwealths on that basis is not evident before the beginning of the Roman conquests.

The third and last stage in political development is that in which we are now engaged, in which the ideal is to unite diverse peoples, each retaining more or less of their original ethnic motives, in one commonwealth, giving to them all a like chance in the common life, allowing none of the inherited differences of quality or tradition to limit the rights and opportunities of any of the individuals sheltered by the state. This ideal has slowly developed since the last great awakening of Occidental thought. It began with the movement of the Renaissance, it has more or less affected the conditions of all the states about the north Atlantic and the eastern Mediterranean. It has been of most effect in the United States, England, and Switzerland. It is still in what we may term the experimental stage; in general, it has proved successful when the original ethnic diversities were not very great; it is to be counted as yet unsuccessful where the differences are of a high order. So far as varieties of religion or of social custom are concerned, they seem reconcilable in modern commonwealths. As to those larger differences such as are denoted by color, shape, or general

intellectual capacity, it evidently remains an open question whether they can be accommodated in this scheme of political association.

Looking at the results of the Roman type of state, that in which the ethnic varieties included in the association are at once subjugated and protected, and where their tribal motives are respected, we find a system which within certain limits works in an admirable manner. The dominated folk are in general left to the guidance of their ethnic motives, they are taxed for the benefit of the conquering state, and have to bear arms in its service, but they retain the most precious of their rights. So long as the ideal of a state is for the benefit of the few the Roman method of combining people of varied ethnic motives in one dynamic association is satisfactory. It may, indeed, be held that, with one exception, never before or since the latter centuries of Roman rule have such diverse kinds of men been so effectively blended in a state. That exception is the rule of England, where within the last half century, by the extension and bettering of the Roman system, yet more diverse peoples have been brought under one control.

There are two difficulties connected with the Roman method or its English adaptation. In the first place it does not meet the demand for the conditions of a democracy which is at the foundations of our

modern politico-social endeavors ; and in the second place it in no sense helps to the solution of the gravest problem of the situation, which is as to the ways in which diverse ethnic groups can dwell together in an intimate geographical as well as political relation. The ethnic elements of the Roman state were to a great extent separated from one another, as those of England now are ; but the problem of to-day, particularly in America, concerns the ways in which the diverse peoples can be brought to dwell side by side as contributors to a common life. Fellow-citizenship in the Roman sense can be easily attained, for it meant no more than the right to the protection of a state strong enough to give it effectively. In the sense in which we would have it, — that is, an equal share of all the duties as well as the benefits of the commonwealth, a chance to act with no other limitation than that set by capacity, and with the inborn powers of each developed to the utmost, — this end has not as yet been attained, but it is the worthy goal that modern democracy has set.

It may here be noted that the Roman plan of the state was in its time unique ; mere subjugation of puny tribes is indefinitely old, but the idea of tolerance which permitted the dominated people to retain a place as sharers of the commonwealth other than as vassals, which set the gods of aliens beside their

own, was an innovation, one hitherto without parallel in history. There is no trace of any such political liberty among the Greeks, who, with all their conceptions of life and action, never in politics escaped from a rather narrow ethnic motive. The reasons for this singular and rapid development of the Roman type of confederacy are not evident. They are, perhaps, to be found in part in the dutifulness of the Roman spirit, a motive which made them peculiarly willing to sacrifice prejudices for their ideals of the commonwealth, combined as it was with a remarkably uncritical state of mind. They were so little moved by the skeptic motive of the Greeks that they never entered in any field of science, and in the arts no invention or considerable improvement came from them. This lack of concern with things that are not perfectly evident limited their interest in theology to the observance of inherited forms. They had little or no sense of that devotion to spiritual affairs which has so influenced the Hebrew people. This combination of qualities served to make them masterful men of business and they made their state the noblest shop the world has ever known. Their motive afforded no basis for ethnic prejudices, for the fellow-man was but a bit of utility that should be made despite his vagaries to fit into the polity of the state; if he did his citizenly duty it did not

matter what was the color of his mind or hide. Despite its manifold evils, in its best centuries the Roman system is the noblest work that man accomplished in the way of government until the British Empire came to its best estate, and in some ways it transcends that great work.

One of the consequences of the Roman success in the government of alien peoples is that it has remained to this day as an ideal of imperial control. Nearly every government has had its concepts of civil polity affected by an ill-understood sense of how the Roman's work was done; ill-understood because it was not perceived that without the spirit of Gallio its work could not be done. All the many experiments of reconciling and combining diverse peoples under modern rulers has failed because those rulers have been animated by their own ethnic or tribal motive, which suggests that dominated people must live and think in the manner of their masters and that existence is intolerable until they are made to do so. If we look over the history of Europe we find, with trifling exceptions, of which Switzerland is the most prominent, and even in a measure there, that the impulse to insure uniformity in language, mode of local government, and even less important features, has been the basis of never-ending contentions. Further on in this book I shall give an

illustration of this in the case of the expatriated Jews; but if the reader knows no more than the outlines of the histories of the countries which were once within the limits of Roman control, his memory will supply a host of instances where the modern ruling spirit has failed when that of the Empire would have succeeded. Of these perhaps the most indicative is that of English rule in Ireland, where for near eight hundred years the effect of the ethnic motive of rulers has been admirably and disastrously exhibited, and where for all time it has been shown how, short of extermination, it is impossible to reduce a vigorous folk to acceptance of alien ideals of life.

The whole story of European conquests since the discovery of America is one vast illustration of the impossibility of profitable subjugation of alien folk on other than the Roman plan. Half a dozen states have essayed it in Asia, Africa, and the Americas, but the result has been that no peoples have ever been brought to the habits of their conquerors. Hundreds of tribal associations have been destroyed in these modern conquests, but in no instance known to me have any of those primitive societies been effectively adopted into the life of the conquering people. The nearest approach to success in this field of endeavor has been with some of the tribes of

North American Indians who have been brought to dwell in amity with our people; but in no case can these reconciliations be deemed really successful, for the remnants merely abide in our state, taking no serviceable part in its life.

In the parts of the Americas and other countries colonized by the Latin Europeans, the problem of contact between the invaders and the indigenes has been, in a way, settled by the amalgamation of the diverse races. This is an ancient, and, so far, the only successful plan of breaking down the barriers between widely parted ethnic groups. Where the physical differences between such groups are but slight, say of the value that exists between the various stocks of Europe, or in general of less than race importance, miscegenation has proved on the whole advantageous; but the evidence is overwhelmingly to the effect that the admixture of the blood of stocks as diverse as the Negroes and the Aryans, or the South American Indians, has very evil results, — the hybrids generally being weaker than either parent stock, rarely surviving to old age, and without their more valuable mental and moral qualities. It should, however, be noted that even where the differences of race are as great as those between the American Indian and the European the result of the cross-breeding may be fairly successful,

the half-breeds being men of good physique and fair mental ability. The Cherokee chief Sequoia, one of the most remarkable men this country has produced, was a half-breed. To him we owe the interesting and most difficult invention of the Cherokee alphabet or rather syllabary, which is still extensively used. When we remember that this Cadmean feat was accomplished by an essentially illiterate person, it has to be reckoned as one of the most noteworthy of recent times.

The simpler and more striking failures of conquering peoples in appropriating alien tribes appear to be due to the incapacity of primitive folk to endure the continued stress of toil which is demanded in the state of civilization. This social state depends mainly on the ability of men and women to labor during the period of vigorous life. While the greater part of the impulses which serve to hold our society together are derived from the life below the human plane, those which lead to effective toil are of late origin. In the series below our estate the creatures take no account of needs to come; they accumulate no store of food and show no trace of forethought. The random species of mammals which make any provision for the future, such as the rodents, are all far away from the series that lead to man. In the lowest men now existing, — presumably in culture much above

the most primitive, — while there is some impulse to accumulate wealth, it does not attain sufficient strength to lead them to continuous labor. The habit of toil appears to develop very slowly and not to be well instilled until the tribal society attains a complexity which admits of taskmasters, of men with authority to enforce labor on subordinates. It seems likely that the development of the labor habit has been in some measure effected by natural selection, those societies in which it became established winning therefrom a better chance of survival in the ages of conflict between tribe and tribe. In some instances, as in the African Negroes, where the population was relatively dense, the capacity for toil was brought to a high development though the other social conditions were relatively low. In other cases, as with many tribes of North America, while the people may have won far up in other human qualities, they have not developed the laboring habit.

Perhaps the best illustration of the difficulties arising from the lack of development of toiling capacity is found in our American Indians. The people of this stock are, as regards their general intelligence, little, if at all, below the average of Europeans. Their physical development is probably rather above the plane of the so-called Aryan folk. Excluding certain of the degraded tribes, such as the

Digger Indians, they are well-made creatures. When stimulated by the war-humor or the excitement of the chase they are remarkably enduring, but they cannot stand steady toil. When this is enforced upon them they break down. This lack of capacity to apply energy in a continuous manner appears to be due to some peculiarity of the nervous system; as is indicated by the common belief among the pioneers who have wrestled with Indians in combat, that any white man can slay any Indian if he grapples with him.

The fate of the Indian in contact with the peoples of northern Europe appears to have been in large measure determined by his inability to labor. Here and there efforts were made to reduce him to slavery. These efforts were occasionally successful in so far as the mere subjugation was concerned, but the folk quickly died in the new conditions. So far as I have been able to find, they did not endure for more than three generations, except where, as in Mexico, their blood was mingled with that of their conquerors. At best they can be brought to do sufficient work to feed themselves; but their productive activity always remains very low.

It is interesting to compare this failure of the able-minded and vigorous-bodied Indian to meet the labor demands of civilization with the eminent suc-

cess of the African races in that regard. The Negroes of North America have been for many generations forced to toil as assiduously as any civilized men, and their work has been done under conditions of climate, food, and general environment utterly different from those to which they were accustomed in the regions where their qualities were acquired. Yet they remain vigorous, fecund, and highly reactive, having lost nothing of their pristine nature; they are as firmly implanted in this extra-tropical realm as any of our European stocks. Even as far north as New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Ontario to the third or fourth generation they appear to suffer no loss of vitality or laboring power. From this contrast we see that the first condition determining the possibility of bringing alien races together in a state is that their capacities for toil shall be alike well developed. It does not follow that the whole of the accord needed for social efficiency will be thus attained, but equality in laboring power affords the required foundation for all the other necessary relations.

Next in importance to the capacity to work together with them on something like equal terms comes the capacity of a conquered people to change their ideals of life in such measure as is required to fit the spirit of their masters. This ability to alter

the point of view is generally very small. It is evidently least where the folk are imbued with a religious faith of an intense order. Thus the Jews, who have retained a religion perhaps the most intense the world has known, have, though the difference in faith is small, never become effectively reconciled with any Christian society. On the other hand, the Negroes, with a religion of a low and incoherent kind, quickly accept, as far as their mental powers enable them to do, the ideals of the Europeans. There remains a somewhat greater tendency to blind superstitions, but this seems to fade away after a few generations of contact with the whites. Thus it comes about that, so far from identity of race being the gauge of the capacity of a subjugated people to enter into the society of their conquerors, such union may be the easier if in their original conditions they were far apart. The question seems to be as to the intensity of the ethnic motive in the included folk. When this, as in the Jews, is strong, though the other ideals of the two peoples may be very much alike and the races of a quality that favors amalgamation of blood, they may remain hopelessly separated.

In looking over the contact phenomena of the militant races with the feebler tribes encountered in their migrations, we come upon a number of in-

stances in which some one point of difference has apparently served as a barrier to effective union. Thus with the Austrian monarchy the ideal of separation has made it impossible to unite Hungary, Bohemia, and the other states of that association in a firm manner, for the reason that the ancient tribal motive of autonomy has been so strong that no interests of an economic kind could prevail over it. That empire is likely to fall into ruin and its detached peoples to come to a worse estate than that in which they now are, for the reason that each struggles for the shadow of independence. In Switzerland the same motive for a long time endangered the safety of the union which alone safeguarded its ancient freedom. We have seen the same autonomic motive in another form bring the American Union to the verge of destruction. The facts justify us in assuming that there is in human nature a permanent tribal ideal which has to be in some manner gratified. The least advanced peoples found their satisfaction within the narrow limits of the clan; the Greeks found it in their city,—for all their enlargement, hardly at any time attaining to a wider ideal. With their advancement a people may in their imaginations compass a Roman or a British empire. In time we may hope that the extension will lead men to the point where the unit will be mankind.

Looking more closely at the problem of the autonomic desire it appears to me plain that the breadth of the impulse is to be measured by the capacity of the minds of a given folk to include a wide range of earth and men in the field of their sympathies. We see that lads of a town are likely to be divided into rather small bands each with a Philistinish humor towards the other. As grown men, in accordance with the breadth of view to which they have attained, the whole town, the country, the state, or the nation stands for their larger selves. In effect, a man's tribe is so much of his kind as he can imaginatively unite with himself. With some peoples, even where the constructive fancy is large and the sympathies intense, a strong prepossession such as the tenets of a peculiar creed may, as in the case of the Jews, keep the tribal motive within narrow limits. In other instances, as in Russia of to-day, the sense of a common spiritual head may in a measure afford a bond to an indefinite number of separate tribal centers, so that with very great variation in the modes in which it is expressed this sense of the governing unit of their sympathies and understandings is to them the real state.

It should not be supposed that the motive of the tribe, the patriotic motive in fact, is, like many another of the impulses derived from the lower life of beast

and man, a thing that can lightly be put aside or of a nature to disappear with advancing culture. If seen correctly it will be recognized as an extension of the instincts that hold kindred together, and as ineradicable as the motive of the family. Those who have known the American Indians or other primitive folk in the various conditions of their contacts with the whites must have seen in the very aspect of the people the mighty satisfaction which each individual has in the sense that his tribe is strong, and the sorrowful degradation which comes upon him when he no longer feels its shelter. Thus the prosperous Flatheads of Montana, who retain their tribal freedom because they have to a great extent avoided war with the whites, or the Seminoles of the Everglades of Florida, who have curiously managed to keep their hold on that wilderness and have never known an Indian agent, are still the ancient proud red men, while the remnants of the once great tribes of the plains are cowed and despondent. It is, indeed, evident that tribal affections may go far either to uplift a man or to take away a part of the natural sympathetic foundations of his life. We cannot expect to replace those affections at our pleasure, giving in exchange those of some other tribe or state to the man who is grieved for the loss of his own. The relation of human beings to their societies rests

upon primitive affections such as have engendered our own patriotism. They are not rational motives and are not readily to be qualified by reason. They are to be respected because they are of the noblest and largest part of man's inheritances.

The value of the ethnic or tribal motive in giving a sense of efficiency to any society has been adverted to. When civilized states come to reckon on this value we may hope to see them make the inevitable extensions of their domains without unnecessarily disturbing the natural conditions of the peoples they come to rule over. That it is possible thus to deal with ancient societies is well shown by the history of British India. By a series of accidents rather than by design Great Britain has attained to a method of government in the East which serves to maintain order and to ensure the amplest commercial opportunities without destroying the sense of freedom among the native people. In its present condition this rule is a distinct improvement on the Roman method, in that, aside from the cost of maintaining the army of occupation and the pensions for its officers and men there is no evident taxation for other than local use. There is effectively no charge upon these colonies that is not for the service of their people. The result of this system since it was cleared of its original iniquities has been that the

states of India have prospered as never before in the millenniums of their history. Various social evils have been abolished or greatly diminished, the people have been free to follow out their indigenous motives; to them the overlord appears in the quality of a protector alone.

The most interesting feature in the unique success of the British government in India is that it has been the work of a people who by nature, as is the case with all the English folk, have little sympathetic interests with alien races. It is not improbable that this task has been the more successful because it has been done in an unsympathetic way, without any great effort to maintain that appearance of friendship which cannot bridge the gap which separates such alien peoples. This success, like that of the Romans, has clearly been due to the fact that the work of ruling has been done in a business-like manner for very definite, limited ends, and with the minimum of action that would attain them. As the Romans succeeded in part by their lack of definite religious conceptions, so the English by their Protestant unwillingness to force their theology on other folk have avoided the gravest dangers incident to their task.

Summing up the results of this brief review of race motives in relation to government, we see that

perhaps the most frequent source of maladministration arises from a failure to understand the value of the motives entering into the conditions which determine the success of a commonwealth. Even to this day the most enlightened states fail to reckon with these impulses which are as evident and inevitable as gravitation. In order that the matter which has been set forth in general terms in the preceding chapters may be more conveniently exhibited, I propose next to examine into two distinct instances in which alien races have been embodied in our Occidental civilization. In each of these the history is long enough to be illustrative and still afford problems that await solution. The peoples to be subjected to this inquiry are the Jews and the Negroes.

CHAPTER VI

THE HEBREW PROBLEM

IN many ways the contact of the Jews with the people of Europe is for my purpose the most instructive of all history. It tells more concerning the nature of the tribe than any other, and though, as we shall see, replete with shames, affords a better sense of the capacity of the abler tribal organizations to endure trials than is found elsewhere. If it had been contrived for the purpose it could hardly have been more effective. The story, though in a general way known, is in its important features often misunderstood. It is, indeed, very difficult to set forth any account of it, for the record comes mainly from persons who share the prejudices that led to the misdeeds. Fortunately, in this instance, we have for a period of about six centuries various fragments from Greek and Latin authors, many of whom appear to have looked upon the Jews as an interesting people, about whom they wrote without religious prepossessions. There have been several compilations of these judgments, the oldest being that of

Alexander Polyhistor, made in the first century B. C., and Josephus, "Contra Apion," which have been the basis of most of the subsequent like undertakings. Of these essays by far the most valuable is that which we owe to Théodore Reinach.¹ He has brought together more than two hundred extracts, taken from more than one hundred authors, the greater part of the matter serving to illustrate the impression which the Hebrew people made on the literary men of other races who came in contact with them. Many of these writers had evidently looked upon this folk in the manner of intelligent publicists who desired to see clearly and note with fairness what they saw. Even when they evidently do no more than render to us the general opinion of the societies in which the Jews had been introduced, their writings have value as indices of that opinion. Thus we have the basis for the study of the contact phenomena of the Israelites with the Aryans for over half a thousand years without encountering the peculiar difficulties we meet in the Christian records.

For the history of the contact of the Jews with the Christians of various sects, we have a great body of literature which is naturally very untrust-

¹ Théodore Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaïsme* : E. Leroux, Paris, 1895.

worthy save to show the curiously malevolent spirit developed by that intercourse. The best summary account of this period comes to us, also, from Théodore Reinach in his history of the Israelites.¹ In this work the author has treated in a summary way the history of his people in all the lands where they have developed considerable societies. From it the reader may attain a fair idea of the general relations between the Jews and their masters of other faiths, Mahometan and Zoroastrian as well as Christian. What seems to me perhaps excessive attention is given in this work to the matter of persecutions, and hardly enough to the ordinary life of the unhappy people; but in a history of brutal wrongs it is most natural that such episodes have claimed much attention. They are indeed of a nature to blind even a Christian observer to the larger questions as to the source of the invincible hatred which those who deemed themselves followers of Christ vented upon the race whence came their faith.²

¹ *Histoire des israélites depuis l'époque de leur dispersion jusqu'à nos jours*, par Théodore Reinach : Paris, 1885, Hachette et Cie.

² It should be understood that my personal knowledge of the Israelites is limited to observations in the United States, and in various European countries, and to considerable communication with men learned in matters concerning that people. I have been interested in these problems for more than thirty years, and have taken every convenient opportunity, really all too few for the purpose, to gain knowledge concerning them.

Before their dispersion, the Jews had for some centuries occupied the Syrian part of the Anatolian Peninsula, in which the people had taken on their tribal character. There had been periods of captivity such as other folk of that time had to endure. During these, considerable numbers of the people had been for generations held in subjection in Egypt or in Mesopotamia. These and other struggles with their neighbor had served to intensify an ethnic motive, which appears to have been originally strong, making it the most intense this world has ever seen. The conditions of the periods of captivity were unlike those of the later slavery, such as developed in Greece and in Rome, in that the folk appear to have lived together, retaining their own customs, not being dispersed in a way calculated to break up their tribal spirit.

During their long residence in Judea, the Israelites were almost exclusively tillers of the soil and herdsmen. It is doubtful if any similarly numerous and civilized people were ever so little given to manufacturing or to trade. Their domestic arts were of the simplest, and they made no advances in the fields of science or æsthetics. Their agriculture evidently was of an excellent, intensive kind, for in an arid region where only a small part of the soil is tillable, they managed to maintain a denser popula-

tion than could have been nourished without skillful toil. Although a warlike people, the Hebrews never developed an aggressive motive. This was probably due to their lack of a proselyting spirit. They hungered, as they have always done, for domination, but they instinctively sought that end by the multiplication of their own stock and not by adopting others into their tribal system.

This is not the place to consider the evolution of the dominating monotheism which is a characteristic if not the peculiar feature of the Jewish religion. It is sufficient to say that it was not as peculiar as it has been held to be, and that it alone does not account for the marvelous integrity of the tribal motive of that stock. So far as this was not a psychologic accident, or, in other words, due to an inexplicable plexus of influences, it appears to have been brought about, in part, at least, by the rigid system of religious observances which served at once to keep the faith ever present and to afford a very distinct bar to intercourse with other tribes. Moreover in that faith there was an obsessing belief in the speedy coming of a heaven-sent leader who should set their people as rulers over all the earth. In these conditions the Israelites developed a very compact society animated by the most intense ethnic motive of which we have a record. Their numbers, the rela-

tive isolation of their country, and their indisposition to interfere with their strong but distant neighbors might have served to maintain the people in peace for many centuries. Unhappily, two events combined to make an end of their good fortune. The founding of the Christian sect, followed by its successful implantation in the countries about the Mediterranean, and the nearly coincident rise of the Roman power, together laid the foundations of two thousand years of misfortune. Either of these two happenings taken alone might not have been overwhelming in its effects; acting together, they were to this unhappy people as the upper and nether millstones.

The Israelites were well accustomed to sectarian controversies in which the verity of Messiahs was the subject. If the Christian sect had not spread to other races it would either have converted the folk to the new Judaism, or been suppressed, as other schisms had been. They had endured three captivities and could doubtless have withstood that of Rome, finding their chance of yet another return when with their endurance they had survived the strength of their conquerors. As it was, the Christianized Roman Empire proved to be the instrument which was to crush the people that pagan Rome dispersed. As before noted, the Roman's theory of the

state did not include the plan of exterminating subjected peoples. He was perfectly willing to leave a conquered folk on their ground, and with a full right to worship their own gods, but he required tribute and respect of the Roman laws. The intensity of the tribal motive made it practically impossible for the Israelites to submit to these limited exactions, so in the end the empire was forced to destroy Jerusalem, and scatter its people in such a manner that they came into contact with alien folk who were becoming imbued with the Christian faith. It appears not improbable that the dispersion of the Jews began with the first Roman conquest, for the reason that some of the Jews of Spain claimed that their ancestors had no share in the death of Christ, as they were in exile before that event. They appear to have been brought in considerable numbers into Egypt, at the time when Alexander founded the city which bears his name. The lively interest of the Greek writers in Judaism from the time of Aristotle, appears to indicate some contact with the people of that faith. It is, however, probable that if there were any Jews resident in other countries than Judea they must have been captives, for the reason that expatriation was abhorrent to the people.

The first appreciation of the Israelites by the Greeks which has value for our purpose is in a

fragment from the writings of Theophrastus, a disciple of Aristotle, who died about the beginning of the third century B. C. It is a citation by Porphyry in his "De Abstinencia," from the laws of Theophrastus, which Reinach terms the first monument of the science of justice. It is in effect an account of the religious customs of the Jews, much in error as to facts, but with no condemnation of their practices. He speaks of them as a race of philosophers who spend the day with the Lord, and the night in contemplating the stars. Clearchus of Soli, another pupil of Aristotle, relates a discourse of the master concerning the Jews, in which they are said to be descended from the philosophers of India. Further the master himself praises them in much detail for their admirable sobriety as well as for their continence. Again Megasthenes, who was sent by Seleucus Nicator to India in the third century B. C., says that all the opinions expressed by the ancients on the subject of nature are to be found among the philosophers outside of Greece, some of them with the Brahmans of India, others in Syria among those who call themselves Jews. Hermippus of Smyrna, in the latter half of the third century B. C., declares that Pythagoras borrowed much from the Jews, especially in regard to his views as to the immortality of the soul.

It is not until we come to Posidonius of Apamea, who died about the middle of the first century B. C., that we begin to find any criticism of the customs or faith of the Jews. One or two writers of this period comment on their unwillingness to defend themselves from their enemies on the Sabbath. Posidonius, himself a Syrian, speaks of the people having established laws requiring that no one of them should show any kindness to a stranger, and that on this account the friends of Antiochus urged him to destroy them. About the same time, Apollonius, a rhetorician of Rhodes, wrote a book against the Jews, the first of the long series of such works. Little of this appears to have survived, but from the criticisms directed against it by Josephus and the use of it made by Apion in his diatribe it appears to have been animated by the same spirit as its multitudinous successors, for they are termed atheists, misanthropes, thieves, cowards; it is indeed evident that the battle against the unhappy people was begun at least half a hundred years before the birth of Christ.

Although the criticism of the Israelites becomes more evident in the writings of the Greek authors after the time of Posidonius, it is not until the middle of the second century of our era that an author, Celsus, exhibits like bitterness; the greater part of

the fragments contains no more than passing comments on Hebraic customs, showing no hatred of that people. Celsus appears to have in some way suffered from the exiled folk, for he prays "that the herd may hereafter leave us in peace, having received a fit punishment for their impudence ; people who know not the Almighty, but who have been seduced and fooled by the impostures of Moses." Still it is evident that the weight of criticism is not distinctly against the Jews down to the beginning of the third century. Dion Cassius, a rather untrustworthy historian, much influenced by fables, speaks of them at some length, but with respect. He recognizes the fact that "often repressed they have finished by conquering the right to practice their religious customs." Up to this time the influence of the competition between the ancient faith and that of the Christians is not traceable in the Greek authors. When they disliked the Jewish people or their customs it was not in the least because of any prejudices derived from Christian sources ; according to my reckoning, not more than one in ten of the authors cited down to Julian the Apostate in the middle of the fourth century displays any distinct prejudice against the race. Those who show an active hatred appear generally to have derived their state of mind from Alexandria, where the Jews were naturally

much disliked. There seems reason to believe that the hatred of the Jews among intelligent pagans, Greeks, or Romans of Greek culture, who did not personally know them, was by no means common until centuries after the dispersion. Yet the people who came into intimate contact with the Israelites evidently developed an active dislike for them, and appear, after the manner of men, to have sought in their habits and beliefs a reason for the antipathy which was due to the immediate impressions of contact. The opportunities which would have come to men of letters for seeing the Jews near by were probably small, for though there were many thousand of them scattered through the Mediterranean countries they were aggregated in small isolated communities. The evidence goes to show that even when dispersed in the manner of slaves sold from the markets they quickly came together in their little aggregations, secluding themselves as far as possible from their neighbors. Julian the Apostate in his letters shows a high appreciation of the Jewish faith, and while disposed to criticise some of the teachings of their prophets valued the institutions of Israel so highly that he hoped to rebuild the temple. His affection for the ancient faith appears to have been connected with his apostasy from Christianity.

Passing now to the authors who were definitely Roman in spirit, we find the first of them to show their estimation of the Hebrew character is Cicero (106-43 B. C.) in his "Pro Flacco." Flaccus had been governor of Asia and was accused of having appropriated large sums of money which the Jews of Asia Minor were accustomed to send each year to Jerusalem for religious contributions. Cicero in his plea calls to the knowledge of the judges "the nature of the Jew, the numbers of his kind, how well they hold together, and how powerful they are in the assemblies." He says that he speaks in a low voice for the reason that there are not wanting persons disposed to excite these people against him and against all good citizens. Although Cicero was given to working on his own fears and those of the judges before whom he was pleading, we may be sure that as a very skilled advocate he safely counted on a fit response from the men he addressed. The passage goes to prove that about fifty years before Christ the Jews were a considerable element among the Roman plebs, and that they were disposed to react on their environment. Cicero evidently hated the Jews, for in another place he speaks of them as a race "born for slavery."

In M. Terentius Varro (116-27 B. C.) we find a note of admiration for the Jewish faith with its absence of

graven images. In Horace occurs a reference to the newly awakened proselyting humor of the people. Valerius Maximus states that Cn. Cornelius Hispalus, prætor in 139 B. C., compelled the Jews to return to their own country because they corrupted Roman manners by the worship of Dispiter Sabazius. It is likely that the author blundered in this statement, confounding the god of the Hebrews with a Phrygian divinity. Yet it appears to show that the Jews at this early date had incurred suspicion as propagandists of their faith.

In Seneca, who died 65 B. C., we find a condemnation of the Jewish religious customs, particularly the Sabbath, for the reason that by its observance they lost one-seventh of their laboring time. "Nevertheless," he says, "the practices of this rascally nation have so far prevailed that they are received throughout the world: the vanquished have established the laws for their conquerors." We thus have from the sagest man of his time evidence that the Israelites had won an unusually strong place among the Romans. A like critical note appears briefly in Petronius and in Lucian.

In Pliny the Elder we find a passage full of high praise for the sect of the Essenes. He speaks also of another sect devoted to magic who are followers of Moses. This conception of Moses as a magician ap-

pears also in other authors. Quintilian, who died about 96 B. C., says it is a disgrace to its founder to have organized a nation poisonous to other nations. In Martial, who died about 104 A. D., and Juvenal, who died about 138 A. D., we have again the bitter note. In the latter we find once more the list of iniquities concerning their treatment of the stranger and their failure to take part on the seventh day in the duties of life. Here, too, there is reference to conversions made by the Jews.

It is in Tacitus, born about 55 A. D., that we find the most extended and by far the most scathing diatribe against the Jews that exists in any extant Latin writing. What among other writers appears as no more than dislike is by him set forth with a rancorous hatred. He refers to the order of the senate in the year 19 by which four thousand Jews were sent to fight the brigands in Sardinia, calling them "libertines infected by this (Jewish) superstition;" saying, further, that if they perished it would be no matter for regret. He says of Christianity that it is another execrable superstition which had its origin in Judea. Then follows a general account of the Jews, with a story of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus. Though interesting on account of its style it is worthless as history; its value is found in the light it throws on the state of mind of an able and

judicious man who generally is trustworthy, but who in this matter was provoked by rage to the characteristic anti-semitic state of mind.

From the time of Tacitus onward to the end of the period in which the Roman motive, as distinguished from the Christian, found expression, the few notable records indicate that the state of mind concerning the Jews which we find in Tacitus was generally approved. The last of these authors worthy of note, Rutilius Numatianus, is a poet born in Gaul who wrote in the first part of the fifth century. To him we owe an interesting narration in verse, giving an account of a journey from Rome to Gaul. In this he describes a Jew, with whom he came in contact, in the following terms: “. . . But the charm of this delightful resting place was destroyed by the rudeness of its keeper, a ruder host than Antipathus, a filthy Jew who had charge of the place. . . . We answered him with the curses which his miserable race deserves, a shameless folk who practice circumcision. . . . Whose souls are even colder than their religion: who pass in shameful idleness one day in seven in imitation of their vile God. Their other beliefs are lying dreams of crazy slaves that a child would not believe. Would it had pleased Heaven that Judea had never been conquered by the wars of Pompey and the arms of Titus. The uprooted evil

spreads the contagion abroad and the vanquished nation oppresses its conquerors." The impression we derive from the interesting poem of Rutilius, the latest of the Roman poets, is that he was of very gentle quality. His descriptions of scenery are near to the best we find in that group of authors. That he should have gone out of his way thus to heap insults on the Jewish people shows that their presence offended him sorely.

With Rutilius we close the account of about ten centuries of pagan Greece and Rome with the Israelites, a period comparable in length to that which has elapsed since the time of King Alfred. It is a strange story. In the beginning, when they were not personally known, and while their religion and their customs were fairly well understood, they were esteemed as philosophers. As soon, however, as they began to appear in considerable numbers on the northern shores of the Mediterranean they became the objects of general abuse. It is not that they were folk of curious aspect; Greeks and Romans alike were used to such men; and, so far as I have been able to find, they in no wise revolted even at the blackest Africans. They seem to have welcomed all other kinds of men with an amiable curiosity. I propose further on to examine into the reasons for this prejudice, which, in the case of the

Romans, appears almost to do violence to the essential sobriety of their nature and their business-like way of looking upon the differences between men. The main point for our immediate purpose is to note that the judgment of many of the ablest men of the pagan world, Greeks and Romans alike, was to the effect that the Israelites were a very peculiar and detestable people.

It is evident that the attitude of Christian Europe towards the Jews was but a continuation of that into which the earlier pagan Europe had been led by its experience with that race. It should be noted that the destruction of Jerusalem so far scattered the Jewish population that in the second century of our era it is said that there was no city of the empire where some member of the race could not be found. The evidence goes to show that the Israelites, originally closely bound up with their country, had begun to wander before the final destruction of their city. We do not know the number sold into slavery after the campaign of Titus, but it is likely to have amounted to more than a hundred thousand. There are no statements that afford even a basis for conjecture as to the number of Jews, or the ratio of their folk to the other elements of the population at the time when the Christian church came to hold the temporal power.

It is a common supposition that the Jews entered Europe altogether by way of the Mediterranean. It appears probable that there was a considerable movement into Occidental countries by way of Byzantium and by even more northern routes. Thus it appears that some time before the advent of Mahomet, probably in the seventh century, a considerable colony of Israelites was established on the Volga, and that a king of the Kazans who held this region was converted to the Jewish faith. There seems to be no evidence as to the stock to which these Kazans belonged, or their numbers. We know no more of them save that in the tenth century they were conquered by Russians from Kiev, and that some of them found refuge in the Crimea. Reinach states that certain writers have held the Polish Jews to be in part the descendants of the Kazan colony. A more southern path to Transalpine Europe was open to them by way of Byzantium and the Danube. It appears not impossible that some portion of the Jewish folk of Germany entered that country by this road.

It should be noted that a large, if not the greater part, of the voluntary migration of the Jews, after the destruction of their city, was to the eastward into Mesopotamia, a region better known to them than the Occident. It is evident that they found

there more favorable conditions than Europe afforded, for they were for a time so far exempt from persecutions that after their ancient manner they developed characteristic hostile sects. The conquest of Irak by the Mussulmans, their kindred in race and faith, was for a time advantageous to the development of the Jews. About the year 1000 the dislike of the native people appears to have led to the destruction of the Jewish colonies in Mesopotamia, but the thousand years of their last experiences in the valley of the Twin Rivers appears to have been in many ways the happiest of their race, certainly the most fortunate of their existence outside the limits of Judea.

Next in importance to the settlements of the expatriated Jews in Irak come those of Spain. As before remarked, this colonization may, in part, date back to the first destruction of the temple. It certainly was extensive before the downfall of the Roman empire; and it is here that the struggle with the christianized peoples was the longest and most violent. The earlier of the Visigoth kings were followers of Aryanism; this was a form of the Christian faith closely allied to modern Unitarianism, that is to say, it was without the element of polytheism which was established in the faith by the Council of Nice, and which made it impossible to effect any reconcilia-

tion between the old and the new Judaism. So long as this Aryan creed prevailed, the relations in Spain between Jews and Christians were not seriously inimical, but when at the end of the sixth century the kings became orthodox the trouble began which was to end eight hundred years later in the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula. It is impracticable in this writing to give even in outline the history of the conflict between the old and new Judaism in Spain. So far as I have been able to trace the march of that tragic series of events, the facts go to show that the hatred of the Spaniards for the Israelites was not altogether, perhaps not mainly, because of religious differences, but was due, at least in part, to difference in temper of the contrasted folk. That the treatment of the Jews in Spain was more obdurately cruel than elsewhere, though brutal enough in other countries, was perhaps due to the survival of a certain cruel motive in the Spanish blood which has continued to our day.

The most interesting feature in the social history of the Spanish Jews is that we find there the first clear evidence of a development in them of that capacity for finance which has become so characteristic of the race in all Occidental countries. Here, as elsewhere, the establishment of this occupation appears to have been due to the enforced separa-

tion of the Jews from the land, and the limitation of their employment to those occupations which were deemed for one reason or another disgraceful. Among these the early Christians reckoned the loaning of money at interest, or, as it was termed, usury. In other countries, as in France, we find it specifically required that the Jews shall serve as money-lenders. Thus a people who by native impulse and customary training were fundamentally soil-tillers and herdsmen, and who evidently tended to become agriculturists in the Occidental countries to which they were driven, were forced to peculiar trades such as peddling, garbage-picking, and lending money. Notwithstanding their debased and oppressed condition, the Spanish Jews attained a higher intellectual development than any of their compatriots during the Middle Ages.

The incident of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain is on many accounts the most tragic of all their unhappy experiences since the destruction of Jerusalem. There is no definite information as to the number of people who were forced to leave the country, but it has been reckoned at three hundred thousand. Of these about eighty thousand found a temporary asylum in Portugal, while the remainder were scattered nearly as widely as were their ancestors at the last destruction of the temple. Many were driven to

Africa; some found refuge in Holland, including the family of the philosopher Spinoza; but it is likely that a large part of the unhappy folk perished in their wanderings in search of shelter, which most lands denied them. It is some satisfaction in contemplating this miserable situation that the loss Spain suffered from the banishment of this ablest part of its people proved to be irreplaceable; it was even more serious than that inflicted half a century later by the destruction of the Armada.

The history of the Jews in the several states which now constitute France is, in effect, a repetition of that which developed in Spain, with certain differences due to diversities in the temperament of the people. In Spain, after the torment began, it was particularly enhanced by the secular and religious atrocities which continued for eight or more centuries until the final expulsion of the people. In France the outbreaks came much later, and though more occasional, were even more atrocious than south of the Pyrenees. Down to the beginning of the thirteenth century the situation of the Jews in France was, as compared with that in Spain, on the whole tolerable. In 855 their expulsion was ordered; but it was not effected. The Merovingian kings repeatedly undertook to enforce baptism on the race, but these actions were fitful and led to no very serious consequences.

It was a troubled time, and the Israelites probably had no more than their share of griefs.

There seems reason to believe that something like a reconciliation between the Christians and Jews of northern Europe was in the eleventh century in process of accomplishment. The resumption of persecution came with that curious succession of national excitements, apparently hysterical in their nature, known as the Crusades, — contagions of religious excitement which appear to be due to the same conditions as the well-known “revivals.” The first of the Crusades, that led by Godfrey de Bouillon, in 1096, spread devastation throughout the valley of the Rhine. The undisciplined, insane hordes began their conquest of the Holy Land by despoiling and slaying the Jews they encountered. It is estimated that twelve thousand were slain. From Trêves to Prague this ruin seems to have been general. It does not appear that the local governments or the native people of this district shared in these outrages; in fact, it is said that the Archbishop of Cologne sheltered the Jews in his castle. Those who took part in this crusade were in motive brigands; in fact, all those expeditions were little better than organized brigandage.

The Second Crusade renewed the attacks upon the Jews of France and Germany. The Pope granted to

all who joined in the expedition a dispensation from their debts to the money-lenders of Jewish race, and the preaching monks called for their slaughter. One of the leaders of the group, the Abbé Pierre de Cluny, held that it was not worth while to go to the end of the world, enduring a great loss of money and men, and to leave behind dwelling in peace other infidels a thousand times more to blame for the death of Christ than the Mahometans. Here, again, the magnates of the Church did much to restrain the fury awakened by such priests.

The Third Crusade is notable for the outbreaks against the Jews in England. Up to that time the people had been allowed to dwell peaceably in that country, but when Richard Cœur de Lion was crowned (1189) an outbreak began in London and spread widely, to Norwich, Lynn, and even to York, where five hundred were massacred. From the beginning of Cœur de Lion's reign to that of Edward I. the Jews of England and its continental provinces were the subjects of much oppression, and in 1290, after a century of suffering, all were driven out of the English realm. They were not allowed to reënter the country until the time of Cromwell, when without formal abrogation of the law they were permitted to return.

The condition of the Jews in France remained,

on the whole, endurable long after the outbreak of bitter persecutions in more northern countries. The intolerance awakened by the frenzy of the Crusades appears to have begun earlier and to have been more intense in England and in Germany than elsewhere, except, perhaps, in Spain. When, however, the persecuting motive among the French was aroused in the fourteenth century, it quickly took on the curious and brutal quality which has so often been associated with the outbreaks of that people. The events equal in their horror, if they do not exceed, those of the Huguenot massacres, or those of the "Terror" of the eighteenth century. They serve to show, with other like phenomena, extending over a duration of about eight centuries and down to the present generation, that beneath the amiable surface of this folk, there lies an enduring tiger-like cruelty such as has never elsewhere resisted the influences of civilization. I shall in the sequel have occasion to discuss this diversity in the rate of survival of the savage motive, and the conditions of its resurgence in different peoples. Just here it is not necessary to do more than indicate the existence of such variations; and the fact that this savage impulse seems more ineradicable among the French than in any other variety of our species, a very brief statement of the more brutal occurrences is sufficient to

show. In the town of Blois the whole of the Jewish community, numbering more than fifty persons, were burned alive. In the massacre of Béziers in the war against the Albigenses, in which twenty thousand persons were slain, the Jews shared the fate of the dissenting Christians. At Strassburg two thousand were burned on one scaffold. The worst of these persecutions were due to the notion that the Jews were in some way responsible for the invasion of the plague known as the Black Death. It should be said that these persecutions were for a time as common in southern Germany as in France. It is the permanence of the state of mind in the latter country that is noteworthy.

It is not worth while to follow in more detail the fearful record of Jewish persecutions in the later centuries of the so-called Middle Ages. It may be said in brief that from Poland to Portugal, and from Scotland to Sicily, the people had been slain, driven into exile, or reduced to a state far lower than that to which any other civilized folk has ever been reduced. In all countries they had been forced to abandon agriculture and the mechanic arts, and to betake themselves to employments deemed ignominious, including money-lending. They were compelled to dwell in special quarters of the larger towns, the Ghettos, where, owing to their fecundity,

they lived closely packed in conditions so unsanitary that, but for certain religious rules of cleanliness and an intense vitality, they probably would have been exterminated. In this state they were so far debased that, for a time, even their religious motive seemed in danger of extinction. They developed, moreover, such mystical beliefs as clearly denoted a degradation in their mental estate. Had these conditions continued to the present day, it seems likely that the potency of the race would have been undermined. The inexhaustible spirit of this people is well shown by the fact that whenever there came a lull in the storm which bent them down, we find that numbers of them quickly rose to stations of eminence as physicians, translators, or ministers of finance, occupations which showed that in the worst centuries of their sufferings their ancient capacity lingered in the stock.

The change from the mediæval to the modern conditions of the Jews evidently began with the Renaissance. That remarkable movement of the European spirit had for its most important effect the introduction of the Greek motive of skepticism concerning religious beliefs which led to the Reformation, and to the development of science. Although this spirit is most evident in literature, in the writings of men who were more or less parted from

Catholicism, it penetrated all classes of educated people, and in time so far affected the higher clergy as to make the atrocities of earlier centuries well-nigh impossible. It should be said that, with rare exceptions, the popes and the magnates of the Church had never been leaders in the persecution of the Jews, and in many instances had determinedly struggled against its more serious inflictions. Now the penetrating motive of the Renaissance carried the enlargement far enough abroad to effect a considerable betterment in the condition of this unhappy people. There were no more wholesale slaughterings of communities, no more of the ravages such as attended the Crusades; yet the laws and customs which served to debase the folk remained unchanged, and in certain regions remote from the centres of culture, as in Portugal, the *auto da fé* was still possible as late as the eighteenth century. But there was now a Montesquieu to arraign the inquisitors, and a world of high-minded men to echo his remonstrance in a way to daunt the followers of Torquemada.

The first distinct movement in Germany for the amelioration of the state of the Jews was begun in the seventeenth century by Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg. He permitted certain Jews to be educated in the Medical School of Frankfort.

He and his successor Frederick, though on the whole retaining the ancient oppressive laws, dealt gently with the Israelites and gave them something better than a chance of mere existence. From this Berlin community came Moses Mendelssohn, who was, in the manner of the prophets, to lead his people to better days. Although there had been philosophers of fame who were Jews before Mendelssohn, none other had come at a time, or with the capacity, to enter into close intellectual relations with the Christian world. His eminent ability and his personal qualities together gave him a very high place among German men of learning, and his intimate friendship with Lessing helped him to gain a hearing such as no Jew had won in seventeen Christian centuries. The most striking and important effect of Mendelssohn's work and that of his friend of Christian origin, Lessing, was the awakening of the Jews of Germany to a sense of their capacity. Hitherto their sufferings had not been set before their tormentors, they had endured in silence. In the school of Mendelssohn are to be counted many men who were hardly heard ; though at first to no sensible effect, their influence was in time potent for good.

The first step in the legal emancipation of the Jews came in France at the time of the Revolution.

Except in Alsace and Lorraine, the last edict of banishment remained in effect; but the Jews, after their final expulsion from the rest of France, had been allowed to remain in those provinces, and also at Bordeaux and in the colonies of the West Indies. After much debate, the Assembly, under the leadership of Mirabeau, but with the support of all the higher spirits of the time, gave them the full rights of citizens. Like many another reform in France or elsewhere, the results of the law were for a time imperfect. During the "Terror" the Jews were subjected to pillage. Under Bonaparte their faith was denied the recognition given to that of Catholics or Protestants. Nevertheless, at the end of the struggle justice prevailed, and, for the first time since the destruction of Jerusalem, the people dwelt in a European state, subjected to the same laws as their fellow-citizens of the newer faith.

The example of France in emancipating the Jews was in time substantially followed by all the states of western Europe, so that with the beginning of the nineteenth century the legal oppression of the Jews may be said to have come to an end. Some limitations of rights continued, but they were in nature trifling as compared with those which had existed for near two thousand years. Since the decree of the Assembly the question has been, not as to the

legal status of the people in the states of western Europe, but as to their social station and the conditions of their contacts with the Christian folk with whom they dwelt. It may be said in general that the betterment of the statutes helped in no considerable degree the social station of the Israelites. It protected them in a measure from outrages done under the color of law, it gave them the rights of citizens, but it gave them none of the privileges of the societies in which they dwelt. The gain they had made was due to the rational motives of their sometime masters and not to any diminution of the instinctive prejudices which they have had to meet in their contacts with Occidental peoples. In fact, the instinctive dislike which fences the Jews from their fellow-citizens of the newer faith appeared for some time after their legal emancipation rather to increase than to diminish.

The gain in social status which the Jews have made since the beginning of the nineteenth century has been mainly due to the capacity of the people to win eminence in their modern calling of money-lending, in the scientific professions, and in general commerce. In these fields of action Germany, France, England, and the United States have afforded them large opportunities for winning past the ancient limitations. The result has been that a host of individ-

uals have escaped from the moral Ghetto in which their race has been so long imprisoned. In certain communities, as in the southern part of the United States, where the Jewish people consisted almost entirely of educated folk who had, in a great measure, parted from their race, they have been accepted as social equals. Yet the startling fact remains that, after a hundred years of emancipation, and a phenomenal success in nearly all branches of high intellectual and citizenly endeavor, the instinctive dislike to the folk on the part of the Christians appears to be lessened to no appreciable extent. We thus have presented to us the most remarkable ethnic phenomena that have been developed in history. How extraordinary may be judged by a brief review of the situation.

Although the foregoing very inadequate sketch of the persecutions which have been inflicted on the Jews is quite insufficient to set forth what is recorded of the sufferings of that unhappy people, it may, with the help of the reader's imagination, enable him to form some conception of this most startling series of events in the history of man. What is of record, if compactly set forth, would doubtless fill several volumes of greater bulk than this, though limited to a brief recital of the executions,

murders, pillages, and expatriations of such magnitude as could fitly be classed with the recent Turkish outrages in Armenia or the massacres of Russia which shocked the civilized world. This history would need to be supplemented by the vaster, unrecorded sum of ills, the day by day inflictions of wrong of which either the chroniclers have taken no account, or the records of them have perished. We have to conceive of this unhappy people, for all their ability, and it is certainly greater than that exhibited by any other, living as Pariahs, the subjects of unending outrages which shame every European state—which shame the very name of man. The most important question in this inquiry is to the meaning of these events, the source of the motives which have led to them.

The common opinion as to the origin of the Jewish persecutions is that they are due to religious prejudices alone. The fact that Christ was crucified by the forefathers of the Israelites has, it is true, been again and again used as a war-cry by the common folk; but it has never appeared to have much weight with the leaders among the Christians. Dull as we may believe men to be, it is inconceivable that any above the unthinking herd could have held to this reason for a hatred which is shown to be irrational by the tenet of the Church that Christ was

foreordained thus to suffer, that his mission could not have been accomplished without the unhappy share which his fellows of the orthodox Jewish faith were fated to have in his death. Some have held that we have in this history an example of the curious passion for the integrity and power of a people's God, that the trouble has come from the curious tangle of prejudices which we term religious. The incompleteness of these explanations at once appears when we consider the pre-Christian stages of this history. We have seen that the Hellenes as well as the Romans, even before the sect of Christians was known to them, were moved to a like hatred of the Jews. Every important incident in the unhappy relations of the Christian folk to the Israelites was paralleled in the pagan centuries of Rome that followed the destruction of Jerusalem. That the Roman's hatred of the Jews was not due to any prejudice against foreigners, or those of alien faith, is shown by their accord with Egyptians and Phœnicians, in fact, as before remarked, with all sorts and conditions of men. The struggle with Carthage had been far bitterer and more costly than that with Judea, yet they dealt with the conquered remnant of that African people in the Roman business-like way. No one can go over the records which exhibit their state of mind towards the Jews in the seven centuries of

contact with them and fail to see that something else than religious prejudice was at the foundation of the hatred which such men as Tacitus bore to them.

There is still another gauge which serves to give us an approximate measurement of the value of the religious motive in determining the social status of the Jews. This is found in the recent outbreak of hatred of the race in Germany, France, and in less degree, yet evidently, in the United States ; traces of the movement appear also in other countries. Twenty years ago there were fair grounds for believing that the relations between the two races were near to a satisfactory adjustment in all civilized countries except Russia, and that the beginning of the twentieth century would end the two millenniums of shame. But in the last decade there has been a startling revival of the ancient humor. In Germany, the effort to embody in laws this reactionary motive has so far failed of success, but the social barriers between the people who have a share of Jewish blood, whether of that faith or no, and the other Germans are much stronger than they were in the earlier decades of the last century. It is hardly too much to say that the prejudice is twice as intense as it was then. The French who took part in this singular movement, at least the intel-

lectual leaders of the mob, are about as separated from Christianity as were Tacitus or Rutilius, yet in the manner of those worthy pagans they show a deep-seated and brutal hatred of a people from whom they could have received no serious harm. Thus we see that the basis of the ancient dislike of the Aryan for the Israelite has not been due essentially, or in any effective measure, to differences in religious belief, but rests upon some more fundamental basis of discord.

Recognizing, as I long have done, that the prejudice which parts these races is not founded on differences of faith, I have endeavored of late to note in my personal experience, and through that of many of my associates, the phenomena of contact between the two peoples which gave rise to this dislike. It seemed to me a fair hypothesis that the trouble is attributable mainly to something which takes place in the intercourse between the individuals of the diverse stocks. This is shown to be eminently probable by the facts hereafter to be recounted concerning the contacts between the whites and blacks of this country, where we have excellent examples of the repugnance which arises when folk of very diverse aspect come together. At first, I sought to explain the situation by examining into my own state of mind when brought into relations, as I

frequently am, with Jews. I found, however, that while there seemed at first to be some slight trace of an adverse mental attitude on my part towards these people when I came into personal intercourse with them, the state of mind was partly due to the curiosity aroused by my inquiry which, for the moment, denied me the natural sympathetic forth-going to the neighbor. In other words, it was evident that I had so far won past the original state of prejudice which once was strong, that I could not observe in myself the features which I wished to inquire into. I therefore selected two score of my friends whose testimony seemed likely to be valuable, and asked them to note with care their states of mind when they were brought into what should be neighborly relations with Jews, comparing their emotions with those that were awakened by like intercourse with persons of similar general quality who were members of their own race.

The result of the above inquiry, insufficient as it has been, distinctly indicates that there is something very generally felt by people of the Aryan race in their contact with the Israelites which is peculiar. All save one of these witnesses agree in the statement that whenever the Semitic quality is evident enough to identify the person with that people, they experience a certain definite repulsion. In almost

all cases they are sure that this feeling is not due to the fact that they are infected by the customary prejudice, they believe it to be an impression awakened by the particular contact; all agree that this impression differs from that which is made by persons of their own race of like social condition. It is less clear, yet I think evident, that my helpers generally have a somewhat like experience when they come in contact with persons of any very alien stock, as with American Indians, or, where they are unused to them, with Negroes. Only in the case of other races there is less repugnance, or, perhaps, no definite sense of it, aroused by the contact, while they all substantially agree that there is some share of this feeling towards the Jews which is aroused at the time when they hold converse with them.

I have been tempted to submit the question as to this spontaneous or instinctive contact dislike to a more extended statistical inquiry, but have deemed it best not to do so for several reasons. In the first place, the results would not have even indicative value unless the statistician knew well the quality of the persons from whom he sought help. Any wide extension of the inquiry would do no more than prove that the Jews were generally disliked, and that, unhappily, does not need proof. In the second place, my experience has shown me, what hardly

needed to be proved, that very few persons are able, in the naturally and fitly absorbing conditions of human intercourse, to note their feelings in the manner needed in this investigation. There is, indeed, something unpleasantly near debasement in the process. Lastly, I have found that it was only by much questioning that I was able to bring out the information I needed. Therefore, while the results of this inquiry lack the numerical accumulation which might easily have been given by a more extended process, they seem to me to have distinct value in suggesting at least some of the reasons for this dislike of the Aryan for the Semitic people.

The greater number of those who have helped me as observers in this inquiry note that there is on contact with those who are characteristic Jews a distinct and peculiar state of mind aroused by the intercourse. They are conscious that the feeling is other than what they experience when they meet those of their own race, but there is, as might be expected, no clear agreement as to the precise nature of the impression. So far as I have been able to gather, the state is emotional and instinctive, being in effect the same as that which is always excited by contact of racially different men. To support and explain this primitive emotion there is a natural effort to find some peculiarities of aspect or demeanor

in the neighbor. As to what these idiosyncrasies are there is a considerable difference of opinion. The greater number of the observers agree that there is a failure on the part of the Jews to respond in like temper to the greeting which they send them; they agree further that there is generally a sense of avidity, a sense of the presence of a seeking in the Jew for immediate profit, a desire to win at once some advantage from the situation such as is not immediately disclosed, however clear it might be in the mind of an interlocutor of his own race. Several have stated that the offense came from a feeling that the Jew neighbor was smarter than themselves, having keener wits and a mind more intent on gainful ends. Others state that the Israelitic spirit makes a much swifter response to the greeting the stranger gives them than the Aryan, and that the acquaintance is forced in such an irritating manner as to breed dislike.

This last noted feature in the contact phenomena of Israelites and Aryans appears to me a matter of much importance, especially as it accords with my own experience and with observations formed long before I began to devise and criticise theories on this subject. As one of the Deans of Harvard University I have been for ten years in a position where I have to meet from year to year a number of young Hebrews. It has been evident to me from the first that

these youths normally respond much more swiftly to my greeting than those of my own race, and that they divine and act on my state of mind with far greater celerity. They are, in fact, so quick that they are often where I am in my slower way about to be before I am really there ; this would make them at times seem irritating, indeed, presumptuous, were it not interesting to me from a racial point of view. To those who are in no wise concerned with such questions this alacrity is naturally exasperating, especially when the movement is not only of the wits but of the sympathies. We all know how disagreeable it is to have the neighbor call on us for some kind of affectionate response before we are ready to be moved, and how certain is such a summons to dry the springs which else might have yielded abundantly. In our slow Aryan way we demand an introductory process on the part of the fellow-man who would successfully appeal to our emotions. Our orators know this and provide ample exordiums for their moving passages ; none ventures in the manner of the Hebrew prophet to assume that his hearers will awaken at a cry.

In observations made for me by young men, students in Harvard College, and thus under my own eyes, so to speak, I have confirmation of the hypothesis that an important part of the difficulty of

social contact between these diverse people is due to the difference in the way in which their minds work when they come together. It is an unhappy fact that the last wave of anti-Semitism, that which led to the semblance of persecution in Germany and to the abominations of the Dreyfus incident in France, swept across the Atlantic and affected to a considerable extent the social position of the Jews in the United States. They became unwelcome in clubs and in hotels; their daughters were not admitted to certain private schools: and in various ways the unhappy people were made to feel the ancient burden as in this country it had not come upon them before. Of this resurgence of dislike the Hebrew students in Harvard College had some, though not a serious, share. Thirty years ago, when the Jews first began to be an appreciable element among the students of this University, there was no evidence whatever of dislike to them. They took their place among their mates with no reference to their race; that, indeed, seemed so far as I could discern to be quite unnoted. Following on the last European epidemic of hatred to the Israelites there has developed among this body of students an evident dislike for their fellows of that race. The feeling is by no means universal or intense; it is condemned by the greater part of the leaders of opinion among these

young men; yet it is sufficient to be noticeable and to awaken keen regret in all those who love the catholic and humane motive which so long has inspired that school. One of my helpers in the effort to find the reason for this state of mind summed up his acute observations in the statement that when one spoke to a Jew kindly "the fellow climbed all over you." Examining into this statement I found that it showed, as my own experience had done, that very swift response of the Hebrew to a greeting which is so well fitted to shock the slower wits of the Aryan.

I have elsewhere, and in this book, noted certain of the racial conditions which serve to influence and determine social contact. The matter is of such moment that it may be said again in brief that the way in which the neighbor meets us when we greet him is of exceeding importance. Every such meeting is a psychological crisis by which all the subsequent relations of the persons are likely to be shaped. We have only to observe our daily social experiences to see that, in this instant of meeting, judgments are necessarily and intuitively formed which guide all our subsequent conduct as regards the persons whom they concern. In our further intercourse we may more or less deliberately modify this first impression, but with most men as with the lower animals, especially in the case of dogs, this almost

automatic and curiously swift decision as to liking or disliking made at the moment of contact is essentially unchangeable. This curious feature of intercourse between individuals, brutes as well as men, probably owes its origin, as also its swiftness and intensity, to certain primitive and compelling needs. It was evidently necessary to the life of all the ancestors of man, creatures which were always in the presence of enemies, that they formed swift judgments concerning other beings who could harm or help them. The decision had to be quickly made and acted on. The action served to stamp the judgment on the mind so that a renewal of the experience reawakened the original emotions. This condition, together with the quality of mind in its prehuman and human stages which requires the classification of all objects, will account for the inveterate quality of those opinions which we form of the neighbor when we first come to take account of him.

Turning again to the question of what it is that is presented by the Jew to his Aryan brother at the moment of contact, let us see if we can come any nearer to the solution of the problem by a deliberate presentation of the facts as they are indicated in literature and by the observations which I have endeavored to make. Let us in the beginning state what will have to be admitted by all who hate the

Jews, provided that those peculiar persons are able to form an honest opinion concerning the actual qualities of the people. The first of these facts as to the quality of the Jews is that they are clearly the ablest folk the world has ever known. The Athenians for four centuries surpassed them, but no other stock has ever for one thousand years maintained anything like the mental estate which the Hebrews have held for several times as long throughout the direst afflictions. They are of abiding moral quality in the larger sense of the term, for to them the ruling peoples of the world largely owe their guidance in conduct, and to their own canons they have held more firmly than any other race has ever held to a faith. They are very humane, as is proved by the help they give each other, the good help that has enabled them to live through the ages of torment they have endured. That this motive is not limited to their own race is proved beyond peradventure by their wide-ranging charity to those from whom they have received nothing but evil. It is, indeed, evident that when we meet our neighbor in a Jew the chance is that he is an able, trustworthy man. How, then, does it come about that to ninety-nine of the hundred of our race the Israelites are in some measure abhorrent?

Examining into the physical aspect of the Jews

we find there nothing sufficient to account for this strange instinctive dislike that has been evident for more than twenty centuries. There is a quality in the features and in their expression which is marked and curiously universal, so that while the percentage of Hebrew blood in the so-called Jews of Germany and elsewhere is probably not large, it gives an impress to the countenance which is quite unmistakable. It is, indeed, one of the misfortunes of these people that they are so easily identified that the face is as a hostile flag tending to arouse prejudices against them. Yet when we dispassionately examine their aspect we find there one of the shapelier varieties of our kind. Their countenances are more prevailingly intellectual and to my eye kinder than the average of those we see in the Aryan race. The voice is good, — it usually carries more in its tones than our own. In the lowlier, those who have felt the hand of oppression, there is often a furtive look, but on the average there is as much good human quality in their expression as I find in any other race. Comparing their physical quality with that of our own race we see that they are certainly nearer to ourselves than the people of any other stock. Thus while one might expect some trace of the inter-tribal repugnance which is a part of man's inheritance from the brute and brutal man, it should

be at its minimum in this contact between Jew and Aryan ; it should certainly be much less than that which we experience in meeting Africans or American Indians, and we know well that in those instances it is easily won by and disregarded. It is evident that it is not the physique of the Jew that makes the bar between his race and our own.

Recurring to the contact impressions which the Hebrew makes upon his Aryan neighbor, let us see, if we may, if these can be subjected to any further analysis. First of these we may note the ancient charge of servility mingled with the desire to clutch at any profit which he may win from his fellow-man. While the Jews were much oppressed it is likely that this attitude may have been one of their characteristics, but it is not so now, rather the reverse, for when relieved from all legal oppression their native strength naturally tends to make them self-assertive. This combined with the swiftness of their wits, with what we may term their rate of thought, brings about the froward quality they are apt to exhibit at first contact with their alien neighbors, the quality which, I am convinced, is the most important element in arousing our dislike to them. Along with this difficulty arising from the mental alacrity of the Hebrew goes the gainful motive which is highly developed in them. I do not think that this motive is

less developed in the average Aryan, but our conventional mode of thought prescribes that it shall not be evident in the first stages of intercourse and that in general it shall be kept apart from social relations. We have a convention that the counting-room humor shall be kept out of the household or other places where friendliness should rule, or if it be not thus limited that it shall be well dissembled. It is otherwise with the Jew; even in the time of his national prosperity the trade spirit was mingled with more serious matters. It is apparent in his religion, where he has evidently a sense of doing business with the Lord as party of the second part in an ancient contract. The motive has probably been intensified by ages of life in which contriving for safety has had to be incessant; where the man who was not always intent on the chances of life was likely to perish.

It appears to me from my own observations, from those of the selected persons who have aided me, as well as from the history of the Jews, that their minds work in a somewhat different manner from our own. Our habit is to separate the fields of action so that we have a limited field for preliminary intercourse with men, another for business relations, yet another wherein the sympathies may enter. With the Hebrew all the man's work is done in one

field and all together; he is at the same time friend, trader, and citizen, all of his parts working simultaneously. There is a basis for much friction in this diversity of mental habit. We are naturally offended to find the business motive mingled with affections, for the excellent reason that it is not our way to do this; therefore it appears out of the natural order; were we to change nature with the Jew the offense would be none the less.

In considering the contact phenomena of Aryan and Israelite, we should note the important fact, hitherto unremarked, that the latter people have not to any great degree that imitative faculty which is so generally developed in the lower races of man. This faculty appears to lessen in the higher grade stocks. Although certain persons with Jew blood in their veins have attained distinction as actors, the race as a whole is evidently incapable of attaining to such accommodation of manner as has so often helped to reconcile captive peoples to their conquerors. The fact is that they are most incapable of subjection, being in this regard even more obdurate than the American Indian or the Chinese. The reason of this quality, as has been suggested, is probably to be found in the autonomic character of the Hebrew mind which, more than that of any other race, perhaps, appears to be of an essentially inflexible nature. For more

than twenty centuries the most dominating peoples of the world have endeavored to subject the race of Israel so that they would fit in some practicable way into the mould of Aryan civilization. Every imaginable resource and all the energy that could be applied in the task have left this people unchanged.

It is instructive to contrast the lack of a tendency to imitation in the Jews with the excess of it among the American Africans. Although I have watched Jews closely for many years, I have never seen in them the least disposition to adapt themselves to their neighbors as a Negro quickly and instinctively does. The black man at once becomes the mirror of his superior whether the man above him is his master or no. He so naturally imitates the tones, gestures, and even the superficial aspects of thought of our race, that those alone who have taken pains to search behind the sympathetic mask perceive that he is not a white man in a black skin, but that his deeper nature in many and most important regards is profoundly different from all the other peoples with whom we have intimate relations. This spontaneous imitative humor has stood the Negroes in good stead. It has enabled them to win past the original antipathy which their physical peculiarities tend to arouse in vastly greater measure than those of the Hebrews, and to make the whites who are

accustomed to them their friends. This curious identification, the most complete that has ever taken place between two widely parted stocks, is clearly due to the unpremeditated and singularly well-accomplished adoption by the Negroes of the white man's ways.

The most remarkable part of the Negro's success in adjusting his thought scale to that of his Aryan masters is to be noted in his contact with his neighbors. He has managed to bring himself into a state of mind which perfectly reproduces that half-merry, half-solemn manner with which we habitually meet the neighbor of our race. I have never seen the African on his own continent, but from what I have known of the new-comers of the race in the later importations of slaves into the southern United States and Cuba, it appears evident that this is not a natural but an acquired quality. Just after the Civil War, I had, while engaged in some work for the Government about the sea islands of Georgia and South Carolina, a row-boat crew of five men who had been brought from Africa a few years before. Their manner was entirely different from that of their people who had been for generations with us; they were distinctly wild men. It was difficult to form or keep any sympathetic relations with them. All my contacts with them were abrupt. There was

no common ground of intercourse, but a sense of a gulf that kept us apart. The contrast between my relations with these people and those I had with the completely naturalized blacks was very great and eminently instructive. The like conditions exist in Cuba, where a considerable part of the Africans, because of their recent importation, or because they have been kept apart from the whites, retain much of their native quality. It is, indeed, only where the blacks have had a chance to acquire in mass the habits of their superiors and to form a society pervaded with the Aryan motives that we find this imitation well developed.

The Negro is in his essential qualities far more remote from the Aryan than the Jew. It is of course not possible accurately to gauge such differences, but the impression made on my mind is that the space which separates our essential nature from that of the Israelite has not the tenth part of the value of that which parts us from our African neighbors. In all that enters into the field of religion, the family, and the activities of society, there is essential identity between ourselves and the Jews. Yet for the reason that the Jew cannot imitate our manner of approach to the neighbor or divine his motives just as we do, he remains remote from us, while the Negro, an essential alien, comes easily very

near. In his lack of adaptative motive, it should be noted, the Jew is curiously like ourselves. All the varieties of the Aryan race have the same tribal strength that makes them able masters but unfit to be imitative servants. Those of the English stock have this spirit in singular intensity. In all places and climes they keep their qualities without a shadow of turning. It is indeed evident that if we had become the oppressed in place of being the oppressors, we should have failed, much as the Jews have done, to reconcile ourselves to the lash. It is doubtful whether the fates would have found in us the stuff for twenty centuries of endurance, but with the Jew on top and the English at the bottom, the dismal story would have been much the same as we find it. We should perhaps have been more easily broken, but we would have been quite as hard to bend.

It may seem to the reader, it will certainly so seem if he has the average share of dislike for the Jews, that I have not done justice to the situation in that I have failed to take proper account of the simple fact that they are to our race a very unpleasant people, as is well shown by ages of history in which good folk as well as bad, pagans and Christians alike, have united in deeming them socially impossible. Let me say, in answer, that I entirely agree with this criticism so far as it is warranted by the

ancient canons of human intercourse. No reasonable observer, whatever his individual opinion might be, would venture to question this most striking and universal of all ethnic judgments. I well remember that before I became interested in the matter I was in the same state of mind. I shall in the final chapter of this book endeavor to show more completely what is suggested in this, that our race has hitherto been controlled in its relations with the Jews and other folk it has dominated, by certain primitive tribal motives inherited from the brute and savage, which we have to subjugate in order that we may do our part as Christians and as developed men, and that unless we set about this task of civilization effectively, and in a large way, we shall fail to win the best the world has to give in the way of a true commonwealth.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROBLEM OF THE AFRICAN

It needs no argument to show that the matter of the future of the Negroes in the United States affords the greatest problems with which our commonwealth has to deal. Certain of its simpler aspects have been or are now before us. One of them led by seemingly inevitable steps to the greatest of all civil wars; other problems of no less magnitude now demand solution, problems that are likely to lead to grave perplexities before they are solved, if indeed they are ever to be unraveled. In many ways the African complex is the most peculiar of all the entanglements that the process of civilizing and utilizing men has brought about. That we may see our way to discuss so much of it as relates to the question with which we are dealing, I shall very briefly set forth the main features.

While the peoples of the Eurasian continent were in process of social development in the ten thousand years or more down to the end of the fifteenth century, those of Africa, except for the northern fringe

of that continent in the lower part of the Nile valley and along the shores of the Mediterranean remained apart. In a small way slaves came thence to be mingled with the populations of Eurasia, leaving no important traces of their stock in the mixture. In this, the great civilizing age of mankind, and probably long before its beginning, Africa south of the Soudan was the seat of very many varieties of the black races. That their tribal isolations are ancient, and that they have been for a very great period in the agricultural state of their development, is evident from the remarkable diversity of the varieties in the several species of their cultivated plants, and from the exceptional capacity of the folk to endure hard labor,—features which alike indicate that the population had long ago come to a state of geographical repose, and that the people had everywhere become habituated to toil in a manner never found in savage men while they are in the stage of the hunter.

I shall not enter on the difficult questions concerning the ethnic relations of the Africans. It may, however, be said that while we know little of this matter, except through the doubtful criteria of language, it is evident that the variety of the people is great, and that under the common aspect given by their dark color, peculiar hair, and somewhat similar

features, there is hidden much wider ranging diversities than separate the European stocks. The range of the variations is probably greater than what holds apart Aryan and American Indian, for it includes such extremes as the feeble pigmies of the central part of the African continent, probably the nearest akin of any existing forms to the primitive human, and the sturdy tribes such as the Basutos and the Zulus, who in mere vigor of mind and body are fit to be compared with the European peoples. It is evident that while the African tribes in general early won by the simplest steps of culture, long ago coming, as before remarked, to the stage of soil-tilling, none of them have attained to anything like civilization. They developed no extended social or political structure, no literature even to the stage of organized tradition, no systems of laws, no æsthetic art, and no religion beyond the most primitive stages of that motive. As a whole, they probably had attained at the dawn of history to about the same grade as that they now occupy, and in that state it is likely they had then abided for a period of great duration.

So long as the demand for slaves was well satisfied by the subjugation of conquered folk there was no occasion for the Eurasians to break into Africa and deport its people. The slave markets about the Mediterranean were generally glutted with more

salable wares than the Negro tribes afforded, and in case of deficient supply it was easy then, as now, to better commerce with arms. When, however, with the advance of the Christian motive it gradually became the custom no longer to enslave the conquered, the trade in Africans became more active and that continent was looked to as the source of supply of merchantable men. At the end of the Middle Ages vendable human beings were generally black. This trade, at least in Europe, appears to have been limited, Negroes being used for domestic service alone, and mainly to add a picturesque element to the trains of important people.

The discovery of America was shortly followed by an increased use of Africa as a source of supply of slaves. At the outset of occupation of the new world by Europeans a determined effort was made to subjugate its indigenous peoples, and turn them to use as laborers. This essay was made generally throughout South and Central America, the Antilles, and Mexico, and, in some measure, in the more northern districts, but it everywhere proved a failure. For some reason the American Indian, though as vigorous as the African folk, and on the whole more intelligent, has, as before noted, never proved an enduring laborer, having quickly perished when set to the tasks of the slave. It at once became evident

that the economic control of the regions to the west of the Atlantic would have to be won by imported labor. In this period, from the beginning of the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, the conditions in Europe did not admit of any considerable emigration. At no point was the population pressing on the natural resources of the soil, and while the outgoing spirit of the upper classes led many in eager quests of fortune the laboring people were not tempted over the dreaded seas. The result was that to Africa all the colonizing nations turned for the "hands" which were to win the new empires. It is true that some effort was made to force European laborers to America as convicts or as indicted servants, but the number thus exported was inconsiderable.

There seems to have been little choice as regards the source whence the Negroes were obtained. It is evident, however, that the principal fields of supply were the trading stations of the Portuguese on the Guinea coast, yet it is certain that the importation included many other stocks than those of the western equatorial section of Africa. For besides the descendants of the relatively low grade tribes of the people dwelling near the west coast we find among the Negroes of the United States and the Antilles very many who are clearly derived from the stronger

very distinct Basutic race and now and then a group in which there is an evident infusion of Semitic blood. As it was not the prevailing custom of Africans to sell their own people, those exported from the slave coast appear to have come not from the Ashantis and other slave traders, but from the tribes further to the East, mainly from the stock known as the Mandingos, who probably are of the same race as the Guinea coast peoples.

So far as can be determined by three centuries of trial, this experiment of acclimating a large and varied body of African people to the New World has been perfectly successful. All the varied stocks have retained their strength and fertility, not only in the equatorial belt of the Americas but in extra-tropical regions as well. In the United States, where the Negro is the least intermingled with the European, and where, in my opinion, based on much observation and the questioning of many intelligent physicians, not more than one-tenth of the people have any admixture of white blood, the race is fecund and enduring. It is true that the census reports show a slightly higher death rate than that of the whites, the ratio being about as 17 to 15, but this is probably explicable by the fact that the blacks are less well cared for than the whites, and consequently the mortality is larger. North of the limit of the old slave states

the death rate increases in a rapid manner, so that the negro population would if unrecruited soon become extinct. Yet even in the maritime provinces of Canada there are acclimated families of blacks which have remained in good condition for more than a century. It seems clear that from the equator to about the parallel of 40° north and south latitude these Africans may be regarded as successfully established, and that they are to remain a part of the states in both American continents for all human time.

It is to be noted that this successful transplantation of a people from one zone of climate to another is the first instance of such a change that has occurred in historic ages. It is eminently probable that mankind originated within the tropics and spread thence towards the poles, but this diffusion was probably at a very slow rate and attended by an adjustment to new conditions which was very gradually accomplished. Even the more vigorous stocks of the Aryan race, notwithstanding numerous efforts and with the aid of the resources of civilization, have never been able to stand such a change. The fact that the Negroes endured such transition without any perceptible shock, passing at once from the equator nearly half way to the poles, yet retaining their full capacity for labor and exhibiting no definite liability to new diseases is a proof of their phy-

sical endurance.¹ That their fecundity was in no wise diminished by this migration affords equally good evidence of their vitality which, judged by these tests, is higher than has been found to be the case with any other primitive people.

The accommodative capacity of the Negro's frame is no greater than that of his spirit. He met the grave trials due to a change in habits and beliefs as easily as he did those of climate. Although it is said that some of the new-made slaves evidently belonging to the more militant stocks were unruly and inclined to suicide, as a whole they retained the cheerful simple view of life that characterized them in their own country. As before remarked, their capacity for adjustment by a process of imitation, a power denied to the higher races, enabled them quickly to adopt the manners of their new-found masters and even to enter into their simpler states of mind in a measure shown by no other primitive people. They were able with singular rapidity to acquire the English language. They had to adapt it to their simpler thought by adding certain tenses to the auxiliary verbs as in the forms "gone done,"

¹ It is frequently said, and perhaps with truth, that the Negroes of the United States are more liable to tuberculosis than the whites: yet as we do not know the measure of their original liability to this group of diseases the fact cannot be used to show that they have suffered from the migration.

"gwine gone done," "done gwine gone done," yet in general they speak the language more effectively and with a keener sense of the import of its phrase than is the case with the peasant class of England. It is, indeed, evident that so far as their remarkable imitative faculty has carried them they have come nearer molding themselves on the mastering race than has been the case with any other subjugated people known to us. So complete is the likeness which has been thus brought about, that, led by their categoric motive, the desire to simplify the complications of the world by a rough classification of things, men very generally suppose that the Negro is in his essential qualities what our own kind would be if their skins were black. This appears to me to be a most erroneous conclusion ; one that has already led to grave injustice to the black people and certain if it stay uncorrected to lead to yet greater evils. I shall, therefore, set forth what seems to me to be the actual state of the Negro, the ways in which the eminent good that is in him may be made profitable to the commonwealth and the serious evils of his inheritance in some measure avoided.

Let us note again that before the Africans came to us they had won a good way upward from the estate of the most primitive men ; they had learned

to labor, to obey unseen rulers; they had developed the simpler manual arts, and they had accomplished these tasks in immemorial antiquity. On the other hand, they had developed no historic ability; they were, as regards their capacity for tradition, that ability to knit the present with the past which is the foundation of all civilization, at the base of the human series. This lack is shown by the absence of literature, of religion, and of social polity. These facts appear to indicate that the folk for all their ethnic variety had, in their African life, come to a state of arrest in their development; they had attained to the point in that process beyond which they were not fitted to go. This leads to the presumption that any further progress must depend on an imitation of a mastering race: it cannot come forth from the innate motives of the folk.

There are those who hold a man to be a mere receptacle into which we may by the process of education pour so much as we will of that distillate of experience we term knowledge. The teacher, if he has learned the most obvious truth of his trade, knows that to have any value instruction must be educative, it must awaken inherited latencies, capacities that are in the stock and which all his resources can in no wise create. Given a mind in which the potentialities of thought and action exist, however deeply

buried, teaching is profitable ; otherwise it is utterly vain. The master of the art knows that his first duty is to find what is in the mind that may be quickened : if he strives to awaken capacities that do not exist, he and his pupil are seeking the impossible ; as the Greeks have it, "the one is milking a he-goat, while the other holds a sieve."

The foregoing view as to the position of the Negro as regards the motives which make for advance in the lines of culture that lead to civilization is certain to appear to most of my readers excessively pessimistic ; they cite the development of many individual blacks, and take these instances, on the general principle that where one man may set his feet an army can go, as showing that the whole race may be indefinitely uplifted. In my opinion this argument has little value when balanced with the facts derived from the history of the people in Africa or in America. Here, as in the Old World, the Negroes have not only failed to exhibit a capacity for indigenous development, but when uplifted from without have shown an obvious tendency to fall back into their primitive estate as soon as the external support was withdrawn. The instances that exemplify the ephemeral character of the Aryan culture which is produced by the imitative humor of the Negro are many and fairly indicative.

First of these we may cite that of Hayti, where the blacks have been longer in residence than in any other part of America, their domestication on that island having been begun near four centuries ago. For more than two and a half centuries, or for a longer period than slavery lasted within the body of the United States, these Africans were under the educative control of the Spaniards, subjected to an able people, and completely under the influence of Roman Christianity, a form of that faith that fits well to their needs of spiritual help. The presumption is that the civilizing process was about as effectively applied to them as it was to their kindred in the slavery of the United States, yet immediately on attaining independence, the population began to return to the African condition, and for a century has been, without interruption save possibly by the occasional control of tyrants, steadfastly retrograding. According to the testimony of Sir Spencer St. John, long British minister to this so-called republic, the state of this population is now almost as low as in Dahomey. Certain of the statements of this author, as, for instance, that concerning the occurrence of cannibalism in Hayti, have been questioned by various critics, none of whom however appear to have had his opportunities for observation, or a more evident desire to state the truth.

However it may be, with this evidence of a return to the lowest stage of savagery there can be no doubt that this, the oldest body of Africans in the New World, has proved absolutely incapable of maintaining a society of the Aryan type.

What is evident from the history of the island of Hayti also appears with equal clearness, though with less accent, elsewhere. During the lamentable decade following the Civil War, the so-called period of reconstruction, while the Negroes were in power in the late rebellious states they were evidently possessed by the Haytian motive, and, but for the arrest of the process to which it led, would have reduced the country to much the same state of degradation. Making all due allowance for the condition of these newly emancipated folk, and the allowance due is large, the history of this period shows us that the Negro has as yet and as a race developed no sense of political or social order beyond what he brought with him from his native country. We learn much to the same effect from a study of the isolated aggregates of Negroes which here and there are to be found in the Southern States. Whenever such communities have remained apart from the influence of the whites for a generation, they commonly show signs of a relapse towards their ancestral estate. All the facts we have point to the

same unhappy conclusion, that the Negro considered as a species is, by nature, incapable of creating or maintaining societies of an order above barbarism, and that, so far as we can discern, this feature of his nature, depending as it does on the lack of certain qualities of mind, is irremediable. Whatever we may inculcate into them in the way of a commonwealth motive will remain essentially foreign and will fall away as soon as the school-master is forgotten.

Related to the lack of the larger social and political motives, the Negro exhibits another deficiency which is of much importance in determining his future in our commonwealth. This is indicated by his general inability to act with his fellows in co-operative work. In our own Aryan race, as well as in the Semitic, there is an element of confidence of man in his fellows that leads to the association of endeavor in business. To this the Negroes rarely tend, and, so far as I have seen, the experiments they make usually fail because they have not the peculiar quality of mind required for effective co-operation. Here again it may be, and doubtless will be, urged that the state of slavery, however educative it may have been in certain limited ways, gave no chance for the development of the associative habit. The rejoinder is evident; it is that no such

development took place in the ages of African life, nor, as I learn from others, is there any sign of it in the Haytian experiment.

Turning now from the larger matters of social and political order, let us consider the Negroes from the point of view of their individual nature. The change will be most agreeable, for there is almost as much to say in praise of the black as a man as there is to say in blame of him as a citizen. First of all, because it is of foremost importance, let us note that the blacks with admirable generality have the whole range of primitive sympathies exceedingly well developed. They have a singularly quick sympathetic contact with the neighbor; they attain to his state of mind and shape themselves to meet him as no other primitive people do. Those who have had a chance to compare in this regard the Negro and the American Indian must have been struck by the difference between the two peoples in this most important feature. The Indian, though really much more nearly akin to us in spirit, is so slow to become friendly that we rarely attain to any close relations with him. The Negro comes even more quickly to that attitude than the average man of our own race. While in his method of meeting us he is affected by his imitative humor, which instinctively leads him to take the manner of his neighbor, the foundation

of good nature which underlies his moods is his own. Be it said again, he is rich in the primitive sympathies which came to us not only from humanity but from the life below man. Left to themselves these admirable motives do not become well organized; helped in their shaping by contact with good people of our own race, they readily become creatures fit to compare in moral quality with the best we know. Thus, while she loves her offspring, the Negro woman is apt to neglect them, but as a nurse of her master's child she is likely to be absolutely faithful. Again, though they sympathize in a momentary way with the neighbors of their race, I have never known an instance of lasting sacrificial friendship between two blacks. Even the ties of kinship are weak as compared with those of the whites, yet the instances of devotion of black servants to their masters, as beautiful as any of fable, are innumerable, and of themselves warrant my contention that the race is richly endowed with that faith which makes men.

How good the better Negroes are can only be judged by those who have known them with the beautiful friendliness which so often existed between the whites and blacks in the time of slaveholding, and was the redeeming feature of that institution. Every Southerner I have questioned

concerning his recollections of that time has recalled memories of men and women who in their essential human quality were fit to be placed with the best of our own race. Nor were these admirable men very exceptional. I am inclined to believe that they were proportionately about as numerous among the blacks as among the whites. Thus, while I have known at least twenty times as many persons of my own race as of the African, there are three blacks who well deserve a place among the score whom I remember, for their eminent faithfulness. It may be supposed that these, being youthful memories, are somewhat fanciful; but one of these men, the foremost of them, Jeff Allen, a hotel porter in Frankfort, Kentucky, was well known to me for thirty years, until indeed I was a man of forty-five years of age. Something of his station among men may be judged by the following incident. Alighting from a train in that town, I was greeted by two of my friends, Jeff and another, the then Governor of the Commonwealth. I took the Negro's hand first, saying to his Excellency that I always shook hands with Jeff first. "So do I," said the Governor.

To those of us who knew the Negroes when they were much more knowable than they now are, these precious memories of simple, faithful men afford a warrant of the human quality that is in the race

which may be fairly set against all the evidence that goes to show the general incompetence of its people for the peculiar tasks of the higher civilization, for state building, and for the higher learning. Far above all else that can be said of the quality of men is what we know of their primary human nature, their capacities for love and faith, their willingness to trust and serve those to whom their good instincts led them to turn for help. We need no further evidence that these foundations of human nature are firm set in the Negro character. The history of slavery in this country shows in the clearest light that the Negroes are fit to be our collaborators in the most important work of society. The existing prosperity of the states in which they abound shows that they are effectively associated with the whites in the most serious part of citizenly endeavors, those that relate to bread-winning. We shall have to leave the fringes of that life, so much as relates to statecraft, to the higher learning and other path-breaking work, for the present at least, aside, with the assurance that if a hearty industrial coöperation can be maintained, it will afford a fairly safe basis on which the blacks may establish their life.

I confess myself somewhat puzzled to account for the eminent fidelity so often seen in Negroes to

masters who, from my point of view, seemed not to deserve such faithful service. The feature may be explicable in their case, as in the similar but less noticeable instances of like nature in the lowlier stocks of our own race, where we find an unquestioning devotion to a chief, who by some right of succession, or by his power, impresses the minds of his subjects and wins from them a love that they do not and cannot give to their equals and inferiors, or even to their own children. Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that devoted faith is more easily possible to the Negro than to any other known man of his estate, and that on this foundation it is practicable with due guidance to establish a social order. How firm that relation may be made by proper management is well shown by the conduct of the Negroes in the slave-holding part of the United States, especially during the period of the Civil War, as compared with the experience in Hayti.

It is well known that throughout the last half century preceding the Rebellion there was much effort made to incite the slaves of the Southern States to revolt. So far as I have been able to find in no case was there any evident movement towards a rising except in the Nat Turner conspiracy of Virginia. Yet it is doubtful if that movement would, even if let alone, ever have come to the point of

action. As it was, it was a fiasco. When secession was attempted, the institution of slavery was in the state when, if ever, a revolt like that of Hayti would have occurred. To a considerable extent the method of great plantations had taken the place of the relatively small farms, and a large part of the blacks, perhaps one-fifth of the whole number, no longer came in contact with the households of their masters but knew only their overseers. The sale of Negroes for profit, which in earlier days was deemed unworthy of a well-born man, had become common enough; in a word, the institution which once had a tincture of the patriarchal motive had been to a considerable extent dehumanized. Yet during the whole of the trials of the Civil War and the period immediately following it the Negroes remained faithful to their masters. There were no outbreaks, though the way to them was easy and many efforts were made to incite them. When in the later years of the war the white men of the South were in the armies, thousands of plantations were left to be managed by women, but I have never, in answer to much questioning made just after the surrender, heard of a single instance in which the Negroes turned upon them or even contemned their authority. The conduct of the slaves during the Civil War is perhaps the most surprising and instructive event

of that remarkable period. For my purpose it is of great value for the reason that it shows, as all must have seen who have considered it, how firm is that foundation of affection and good faith in the Negro on which we may hope to develop relations between his own and our race.

It is important to note that this development of good faith in the Negroes took place under the conditions of slavery. I am by no means an apologist of that institution, although my ancestors held slaves since it was established in this country and I was heir to the traditions of that class. A part of these traditions was that the system was an evil; and so far as possible I helped to overthrow it. Yet it is evident to me that in no part of the world and in no other age has a people of lowly race ever for their best interests been so well placed as in the American slave-holding States. Frequently they were ill-treated, sometimes shamefully abused, but with a generality rarely if ever before experienced with enslaved people they were cared for by their masters, especially by the women, with an admirable devotion for their moral welfare and with a sympathy that is told in the true faith of the slaves during the Civil War. The immediate and most serious evil of slavery came not upon the black people but upon the whites. To the slaves them-

selves the relation was exceedingly helpful, for it afforded them a training in human relations, in household arts, and in religion, which could have come to their race in no other way. It is likely that the beneficial effects of slavery were, because of the advancing commercialism, near their end before the middle of the nineteenth century, for the rapid development of large plantations diminished the intercourse between the races. The abolition of slavery and the effort to bring the ex-slaves at once into the position of the citizen has for the time to a great extent broken up the faith-breeding relation between the two peoples.

As regards his other moral qualities it may be said that the Negro is not as yet proved to be of lower grade than whites of like station. That he is prone to thieving in a small way is true, but this vice, common to all primitive folk, was fostered rather than hindered by the conditions of slavery, when he had no chance to acquire a sense of right in property. So far as I have been able to learn, a large part of the race are, in this regard, faithful where they are trusted, and they are, in general, learning to respect the law. They are rather less inclined than the low-grade whites to drunkenness, and appear not to suffer as much from the effects of alcohol. The testimony is to the effect that they

rarely have delirium tremens. Considering their exceedingly difficult position since their emancipation, the sudden deprivation of the moral control to which they have been accustomed, they have shown singularly little tendency to robbery or murder.

It is so commonly stated that it has come to be assumed that the Negro is sexually a very brutal creature who cannot be trusted in contact with white women. It may be granted that his animal passions are strong, and that in his native state of mind, when not under the moral dominance of the white people, he is less able to control himself than the men of that race. Yet the history of blacks during the period of slavery shows that their moral control was as good as in our own race. I do not remember ever hearing before the emancipation of that crime, or even a suggestion or fear of it. Much questioning of others who knew well the social conditions of the slave-holding district has convinced me that it rarely occurred. This fact is of much importance, for it indicates at once that the Negro can attain a moral state in which the sexual motive is fairly well controlled as it is among civilized people, not by fear but through the sympathies. It also seems to indicate that his close relation with his masters served to lift him to that plane.

That the assaults of Negroes on white women in

the South have increased since the emancipation appears to be clear. There is, indeed, some reason to believe that in the Northern States also they are more prone to this crime than the average of white men; but it is not yet evident that the Negro is more apt to be guilty of such outrages than the Aryan of the same low social position. Moreover, in judging the quality of the African in this regard we have to bear in mind the fact that in our own race for many centuries the men known to have been guilty of this offense have been summarily dealt with, so that their evil blood has been removed from the stock. We may criticise our ancestors as brutal, but their condign punishment of such malefactors doubtless helped to elevate the race by a very effective process of selection. Considering that the Negro race has not passed through this process of purification, and that he is now in a most unhappy position, with his ancient external support withdrawn and with no inheritances strong enough to take their place, he has not done so badly. A fair assessment of the situation leads to the conviction that morally he is hopeful material for use in our society.

Having referred to the extirpating process as a means of removing from a stock the strain of blood that tends to crime, it seems necessary to say a word

about the resort to lynch law in the case of Negroes accused of criminal assaults. While I believe that it is a sound and in a large way humane policy promptly to execute every person, white or black, who is legally convicted of rape, I regard the lynching of these offenders, especially with the accompanying brutalities so usually practiced, as hardly less shameful than the crimes they are designed to punish. The law may pardon a man who in hot blood slays the brute who is guilty of rape, yet if he be a true citizen he will blame himself for his rage, for he will know that the offender should have paid his debt to the law. But when men take the criminal from the hands of the law to have vengeance on him, they are murderers. Their detestation of the culprit's offense in no wise lightens their own. Until this American form of crime is eradicated we cannot regard ourselves as a law-abiding people, and a commonwealth without law that is held sacredly inviolate is a mockery.

As for the more purely intellectual capacities of the Negro people, we have again to begin with their African history. This shows that all the stocks which have afforded considerable elements of our American blacks differ from the Aryans in many regards, of which the following are the most important. As before remarked, they originally lacked

the powers which lead to what we may term the historic sense, that disposition to check present action by the past and to treasure the history of the tribe or state. This motive is evident among most peoples even before they have attained to any effective method of recording, all those methods being due to the historic sense. We commonly find among savages a body of traditions and a system of handing them down, or in their stead legends that embody a perspective. So far as I can find all this is lacking in the tribes whence our blacks came. In general their life is immediate, of the day, in a measure that is not recognized without close study of their ways and habitual thoughts. Those who believe that a man is what his teachers make him may contend that this state of mind is due to slavery, the slave not being called on to look before and after, and so abiding in the present; but in view of the history of the race in Africa and Hayti this seems a vain contention.

As regards his rational powers the Negro has a low average capacity. With rare exceptions, his ability in the field of mathematics is far less than that of the Aryan and the Semite. Yet it is to be remembered that the Negro Banneker,¹ a pure black born

¹ See *Memoir of Benjamin Banneker*, by John H. B. Latrobe, *African Repository*, vol. xxi, 1845, p. 321.

in Maryland in the eighteenth century, taught himself the art of computation, and for years published an Almanac much used in the district south of New York. We know nothing of this man's stock except that his mother was the child of Africans, that his father was from that country, and that both were pure blacks. He may have been partly of Arab blood, as appears to have been the case with quite a number of the Negro families of Virginia. In other rare instances the Negro has shown a certain capacity for arithmetic, for there have been "lightning calculators" of their race. Yet at most these exceptions relate to arithmetical power; they in no sense invalidate the general proposition that the mathematics which require constructive ability of the higher kind, as algebra and geometry, are generally beyond the capacities of this people. Be it said that this is no very grave indictment, for the lack is not uncommon in many of the ablest men of our own race.

In the field of physical science the Negro seems hardly more capable than in mathematics. As a student he appears to be inept in all such matters, and in no instance have men with more than a slight admixture of African blood made contributions of any value to this branch of learning. Correlated with this deficiency we find in the race a notable incapacity for invention. So far as I have been able to learn they

rarely devise improvements in the method of doing the work they have in hand. Their arts in Africa were of the simplest nature, and none of their tools or arms have the least stamp of originality. It is doubtful if any of them were devised by the tribes whence our blacks came ; they appear to be altogether from the common stock of primitive man. Against these eminent deficiencies we may set certain capacities of moment.

The Negro has a remarkable aptitude for languages. As before noted, he quickly compassed the difficult English speech, and has effectively mastered it, so that he uses it with more ability than the peasant class of our own race. Elsewhere he has done the like with all the tongues of southern Europe. Considering how lean and poor in connotative words his aboriginal speech was, this shows that the Negro has great latencies of power in this part of the field of intelligence. It appears likely that his native ability in this regard is much above that of any people known to us in the group of lowly men ; it probably much exceeds that of our own race when it was in the savage state.

In the æsthetic field the Negro, as might be judged from his African history, shows no measurable trace of a sense of form, but he has a strong feeling for the qualities of color. His only striking æsthetic capa-

city is for music. His singing voice is on the average much better than that of any other well known race. How far this musical capacity extends, whether it may lead them in the higher ranges of the art, is as yet uncertain. In the development to which it attained in Africa it shows little more than what may be termed the orgy motive, that quality which excites the lower nature as in sexual or wizard dances. In the United States little trace of this interesting music has been preserved, for there was enough of the puritanic spirit among the slaveholders to suppress it altogether. In Cuba, however, I have heard certain dance music used by whites as well as blacks in public balls which is said to be purely African. It consists in a monotonous tom-tom basis with curious flares of the strings and wind instruments. The effect is at first very irritating, but if submitted to, it will awaken a singular primitive sense of excitement, such as I have never found in any other sounds. The fact that the Negro has been able to devise a moving kind of music, even though it be essentially base, appears to indicate that the composing power is in him.

The songs termed Negro which abound in this country are so infected by the white man's music that they cannot be regarded as in any distinct way representing the musical spirit of the people. Yet if

these songs are closely watched, especially in their refrains, we may detect the native movement, that curious savage swing which moves the blood even of the super-civilized. My observations lead me to the conclusion that one of the most interesting experiments that could be essayed would be to train Negroes in the musical art. There is hardly any question but that they would be successful as instrumentalists. Those who have heard the dance music of Negro bands of the better sort and noted the capacity of the untrained minds to work together for a common result, will not doubt that they have orchestral capacity. Whether they can attain to the higher stages of interpretation is of course uncertain, yet there is such a depth of sympathetic motive in the folk that it may serve to open this realm to them. So too in choral music there is a promise of high success; especially as the interpretation there depends largely on the quality of the voices and on the immediate sympathetic movement of the singers.

While in summing up the qualities of the Negro people it is necessary to regard them as they appear in mass, it is very important to keep well in mind the fact, before adverted to, that they are not of one type but of very many types, the racial diversity being greater than that of the European peoples.

These original tribal and racial variations have in this country been in large measure lost by interbreeding, yet, as I have elsewhere noted,¹ an attentive observer of a considerable number of Negroes may perceive the existence of several distinct groups each with a definite race stamp; for in man, as elsewhere in the animal kingdom, there is a manifest tendency of hybrid stocks to revert to one or another of the stronger commingled types. I set much hope in the future of the Negro on the existence of these overlooked diversities. There, as in our own mixed blood, we may expect to find that from the commingling there will come forth qualities of strength which from lack of opportunity are not now apparent. The question of the moment is, however, what have we in this ten million of blacks which can be turned to the account of our commonwealth, and how are we to convert it to that use?

First of all, it has been said before but it should be said often, we have in the Negro capacities for affection and good faith which of themselves alone afford an important part of the foundations of society. Next, and hardly second, an ability to toil which is of a high order; such, indeed, as has never elsewhere appeared in a primitive people. Further, certain musical powers which may have high value,

¹ See *Journal of Popular Science*, lvi. p. 513; lvii. p. 29.

and are sure to be serviceable, even if they are incapable of greater development than they now exhibit, — and along with these a curious disposition to come near to, and to profit largely from, close contact with our own people. Add to this list an enduring body, a disposition which is perhaps more cheerful, more kindly than that of any other race, and we have the qualities with which we are to deal in making this group of men very helpful to our commonwealth. We, the whites of this society, have essentially of ourselves to do this task; this man cannot give us much help, for the motives that build the state are not yet in him. All we know of his history in Africa, all that can be judged from the communities where he controls, shows that in him the state-building capacities are lacking. Certainly in its present and for any foreseeable period the mass of the blacks will have to be guided by the whites on their way of advance, with what help may be had from the stronger individuals of their own race who may prove fit for leadership.

As for the steps by which the Negroes of this country may be put on the way of attaining their value to themselves and the community, only certain of them can be now discerned. It is a long and difficult progress, and many judgments as to means will have to be gained from experience. At the

outset it may be said that at present there is little hope that much aid can be had from the Federal Government. So far as aid from legislation can be helpful, which is not very far, it will have to come from the several states so that it may fit the local conditions. Thus in Kentucky, where the Negroes are few, the laws bearing on these people, if such are needed, may well be different from those of Mississippi, where the blacks are in a majority. At present the main point is to make an end of the unhappy frictions which have come to separate the races. To do this, it is necessary to take the mass of the Negroes for a time out of politics, for so long as the dominant whites are kept in fear of being despoiled of their property and the blacks in hope of gaining power, class ill-will is certain to become greater and there is danger that it be made permanent. Thus while I dislike the element of subterfuge in the new constitutions of the Southern States, and would have much preferred to see a qualification of education and of earning power applied equally to all, white or black, who seek the franchise, I welcome the change for the reason that for a time, at least, it promises a truce to race hatreds.

To those who look upon an abandonment of universal suffrage as a blow at our democratic form of government, where it has come to be assumed that

the franchise is a natural right, it should be said that the founders of our American commonwealth took no such view of the situation; they held that the office of the elector should be guarded by sundry conditions, by requirements of sex, citizenly quality, property and education. Sundry of them are everywhere retained; education has always been required in Massachusetts and its extension to other states is sound polity. In my opinion it would be well if the franchise were universally subjected to the further qualification that candidates for it should be required to prove a certain amount of property or of annual earnings in order to show that they were contributors to the community. This in amount should be sufficient decently to support a family. There would be evils arising from the application of such a law, yet they would be less serious than those which now exist where a host of folk who are in no wise helpful to the commonwealth have a share in ruling it.

Before considering the steps which may be taken to blend the social work of the Aryan and African races, it will be well to consider two matters concerning their contacts that are of critical importance. First of these is the question as to the desirability of mingling the blood of the two peoples so that the natural antagonisms of race may be lost in the hy-

brid product. The other is as to the extent to which the tribal motive, commonly termed race prejudice, may serve as a barrier to the intercourse required in the interest of the commonwealth. As to the first of these questions, we happily have a large body of evidence which, though not in a statistical form, is clear enough to guide us to a decision. Modern studies into the conditions of breeding have shown that very generally, both in animals and plants, the crossing of varieties of the same species, provided they are not far apart, is often distinctly beneficial, the resulting offspring gaining a strength and acquiring an individual variety which on many accounts are advantageous to organic forms. On the other hand, the hybridization of groups so far apart that they may be termed specifically distinct species is almost always disadvantageous, for the progeny of such unions are more or less sterile and usually have not the vitality of either parent. There are certain curious limitations to this rule, as in the hybrid of the horse and ass, where the resulting mule, though almost absolutely sterile, is more enduring to labor than either parent and is regarded as less subject to diseases. Yet the fact that groups are separated by that rather obscure interval which we term specific is safely to be taken as indicating that they should not be bred together.

Quite apart from the investigations of modern naturalists, we have the common judgment that while stocks such as our own have profited by an infusion of blood of other related groups, as the Saxon with the Briton, the Celt, or even the Aryan with the Semite, any union of stocks of more remote affinities than those last named leads to degradation. Now there can be no doubt that the African is separated from the masterful races of the Eurasian continent, the Aryans, the Semites, and the Turanians, by a wider interval than are those varieties of men from one another. By all the tests the naturalist applies in discriminating species he is specifically very distinct; color, form of the hair, proportions of the frame, odor of the skin secretions, all go to show that the groups are about as far apart as the horse and ass, the dog and fox, or the other normally separated species in the same genus. Therefore the presumption is against a favorable result of an admixture of the African with any of the races above named. Experience so far as it has been subjected to any kind of scientific analysis, which is not very far, evidently supports this presumption. It is not only a general belief that hybrids of blacks and whites are less prolific and more liable to diseases than the pure bloods of either stock, but also that they seldom live so long. Statistics lacking in this point, I

have questioned a large number of physicians well placed for judgment on this matter. All of them agree that the offspring of a union between pure black and white parents is, on the average, much shorter lived and much less fertile than the race of either parent. My father, a physician of experience and a critical observer, who had spent more than half a century in Cuba and the slave-holding South, stated that in his opinion he had never seen mulattos, that is, a cross between pure white and pure black, who had attained the age of sixty years, and that they were often sterile. The judgment of medical men seems to be that when the blood of either race preponderates, and in proportion as it verges to one or the other, the longevity and fertility increase or decrease.

It is a common opinion, held by the blacks as well as the whites, that an infusion of white blood increases the intelligence of the Negro, while at the same time lowering his moral qualities. On this point we have no clear evidence. All we can say is that in certain instances, as in the novelist Dumas, a considerable proportion of Negro blood, probably about one-fourth, was consistent with a marvelously active fancy and much dramatic power. One of the distinguished physiologists of the last century, a man, indeed, of rare quality, was said to be an octo-

roon, and this statement seemed to be verified by his aspect. Almost all the Negroes of this country who have shown marked capacity of any kind have had an evident mixture of white blood. On the other hand, Banneker, the one of the race who seems to have been intellectually a really great man, is said to have been a pure Negro. Therefore, while the evidence, such as it is, points distinctly to the conclusion that the body of these hybrids is weakened and its fertility impaired, it remains uncertain whether their mental and moral value is lessened or increased by the mingling of blood.

There are other sufficient reasons why miscegenation cannot be looked to as affording a way out of the difficulties of organizing a commonwealth composed of two races of widely different grade. One of these is the existence of a deep-seated, intense and apparently ineradicable prejudice on the part of the whites against such unions, and the other that the process as is shown in Hayti and elsewhere does not lead to unification but to the establishment of a third element of race discord, the people of mixed blood setting themselves apart from the pure stocks on each side. We know that differences of far less moment are readily made the basis of social categories, so that a division between the hybrids and the pure bloods might be expected to arise; but the

intensity of prejudice as it exists in Hayti is surprising; it shows not only the deep-seated nature of these racial prejudices, but the practical impossibility of avoiding them by any mingling of the blood short of a complete mixture. We may, therefore, assume that the Negroes and whites are to remain racially as they are, and that laws prohibiting intermarryings and those concerning bastards will tend to prevent further mingling of their blood; also, that as the social condition of the Negro improves, the death-rate, which now somewhat exceeds that of the whites, will be likely to decrease so that the population of both races will augment at something like the same rate. By the end of the present century it is probable that the number of those of African descent in the United States will exceed the total existing population of all stocks.

Turning to the measure of prejudice which will have to be encountered in dealing with the Negroes, it may be said that it is with most people of our race very intense, far stronger as a natural impulse than that awakened by any other race with whom we come in contact, such as the American Indians or the Chinese. This dislike is primarily instinctive, and in no wise depends on opinions as to the qualities of the Negro, as is indicated by the fact that several of the most devoted friends of his race have,

in answer to my questions, and confidentially, told me that the first impression made on them by contact with a black was one of painful repulsion. As most people are very properly ashamed of this impulse it is not easy to obtain evidence as to its generality, but from much inquiry I am convinced that where the black people are unfamiliar the beholding of them is inevitably painful, and often in a high measure repellent. The reason for this effect doubtless is that we form and continuously retain images of how a human being should appear; and that these images include all the types with which we are familiar. When a human shape comes to us that does not fit these types it appears monstrous and inhuman, arousing disgust or fear, or both. In beasts as well as in man the shape of their kind is dear to them and abnormalities offensive. In Europe the black skin makes the same impression as with us, but Europeans generally see more varieties of men than we do and become more tolerant of the variations of human kind.

Fortunately for the whites as well as the blacks this impression of abnormality soon disappears. Let a white man remain in friendly intercourse with Negroes for a few months and he will no longer note that they are black. It is much the same as with a distorted face. At first it is abhorrent, but if we be-

come friendly with the spirit behind it, we no longer note the distortion; we may even forget in what manner the countenance is misshapen. It is an interesting fact, if my observations on the matter are correct, that the instinctive dislike to the Negro disappears much more quickly than the prejudice against other races less remote in quality of body from ourselves. I have never known an instance in which it persisted, provided the contacts were intimate. On the other hand, I have found many who were, after a life-time of experience, offended by the aspect of the Jew, who differs so little in appearance from the Aryan that we are often in doubt as to our judgment concerning his race. This swifter reconciliation with the Negro is probably to be attributed to the fact that he has adopted the white man's ways, as well as to his ready sympathies. In the regions where the blacks are numerous enough to be familiar we find no instinctive prejudice against them. On the contrary, there is still a large measure of the ancient good will between the races which developed in the period of slavery, and with the fear of danger arising from the Negro vote eliminated, there is no evident reason why those good relations may not be restored. The Negro instinctively tends to seek the help of the stronger race; he has the sympathetic nature that will pay in devotion for

that help; it will be the white man's fault if they do not abide together in amity.

In looking forward to the immediate methods whereby the relations between the blacks and whites may be bettered, it seems obvious that the first step should be to develop the citizenly capabilities of the blacks along those lines of endeavor for which their peculiarities fit them. For the most part I do not believe that the Negroes at present need or can profit by much of what is ordinarily termed the highest education. Save in rare instances, there is nothing to be gained by pushing them towards the professions. Those thus trained cannot, at present, expect to find their way to satisfactory employment. Where a youth fit for professional work appears, he should be trained in colleges with the whites. In general, the only way up for this people is through agriculture and the handicrafts. That is, indeed, the sole way that a primitive folk have ever won upward to better stations.

Although the Negro is less inventive than the Chinaman, his imitative capacity is large and he can be trained to be an excellent mechanic. He is a lover of the soil and can make a good farmer. The Negro overseers on the small plantations of the South showed in this regard much ability. The women, though naturally slovenly, are eminently

trainable; they have, as is well-known, a capacity for cooking; they have the instincts that fit them to be nurses. It is to such training, with the necessary rudimentary schooling, that we have to look for the immediate development of this folk. The best part of the present unhappy transitional state of the Negroes is that this need of craft-education is beginning to be appreciated by the people of this country. We owe much of this gain to General Armstrong and to Booker Washington, men who saw the need and went straight forth to meet it; but the schools and the masters are all too few. There should be a quarter of a million youths of the race now learning trades, while there is less than a hundredth part of that number thus engaged. The expenditure required for the effective trade education of the Negroes would be large. Allowing the net cost of pupils in technical schools to be no more than two hundred dollars per capita, and the duration of the schooling to be two years, the annual cost of training the above-mentioned number would be fifty million dollars. Though this sum could be profitably spent, it is perhaps impossibly large. The question arises whether the end cannot in some measure be accomplished by a return to the old system of apprenticeship which has been so generally abandoned in our white communities. There are,

however, serious objections to this method in the fear the Negroes would most likely feel that there was a taint of the old slavery in the relation; moreover the trade-unions generally refuse to admit the blacks into shops where their members work. Apparently the only immediately effective way rapidly to extend this training is by establishing local day schools of such trades as carpentry and blacksmithing in the towns, and by such training in farming as can be given in schools of agriculture.

Although the Negro lacks any considerable economic foresight he is fortunately rather acquisitive, being in this regard as in most others better material for the uses of civilization than the abler American Indian. Already many of them are accumulating wealth. It is evident that in them the gainful motive can be developed in something like the proportion that it has among the whites. If the franchise were made to depend upon the possession of property it would greatly aid in stimulating this motive. Dr. Johnson held that men were rarely so well employed as when they were earning money. His statement is particularly true with the Negro, for more than any other man he needs the effects of a full purse. From it he will win the sense of station which is denied him in politics. Property would, indeed, give him a place in the world that he

can attain in no other way. In a community with an average share of well-to-do blacks we may be sure that the contempt of the whites for the capacities of the race — the most menacing element in the present situation — will pass away, for the folk will thereby prove themselves respectable.

To further the accumulation of property by the Negroes it is most desirable that a system of savings banks should be instituted in the Southern States. The lamentable incident of the banks of the Freedman's Bureau, still well remembered, has made it impracticable to establish any like institution; moreover, the general economic conditions of the South are adverse to such an establishment. The only effective way is to have the Federal Government take, through the post-offices, the savings of the people, giving them the ample security which it alone can offer. There are objections to this plan, but the most serious of these would pass if the rural postmasters were well-selected and permanent officials. The needs are such as should compel our Federal Government to lend this help. At present the Negro who is inclined to save is subject, while the money is in his hands, to the temptations of the moment. He rarely has the fortitude to accumulate until he is able to make his first payment for a bit of land. A chance to have the Government his banker would greatly appeal to

him. For, while he has had little but disappointments in the way of expectations of Federal aid, that power still mightily appeals to his imagination. Here we find the only practicable help that the Government can, in the present condition of affairs, afford to offer the South; the offering would not of course relate to the Negro as a class, though the warrant for it comes mainly from his needs.

It is highly desirable that a considerable part of the Negroes should become land-owners, for thereby they will be established as citizens, with an interest in the commonwealth. In the present state of their ideals, however, it has to be confessed that there is some danger in the development of a cotter class in the South, for, with rare exceptions, whenever a black man owns a place he neglects it; he is usually content with a dirty shanty, and while he has much natural faculty for the immediate tasks of the farmer, his lack of foresight leads him to wear out his fields. As is well known, the lands of the South have been sorely taxed by bad agriculture, though of late years there has been a very great improvement in this regard. There is evidently reason to fear further depredations from an extended possession of the soil by the Negroes. Here we shall have to trust to the imitative motives of the race and to the training of a minority of them in the art of farming, with the

hope that the contagion of example may help the conditions.

While it is evident that the Federal and even the State Governments can do little to better the situation of the Negro, he should by no means be left alone to "work out his own salvation." Unlike the most of the people who come to us from Europe his race is not provided with the motives that lead to safety. His elevation and maintenance, so far as we can see for all time, absolutely depend upon the help he is to receive from the state building race. In larger part this help will have to come from day-by-day precept and example, as it came to him in the centuries of slavery with another accent but with like efficiency. In part it may best be given by means of local associations, mainly composed of the whites, but admitting the abler blacks, which shall, in the manner of the Village Improvement Association now so common in the North, undertake to care for the conditions of conveniently limited districts. Without legal power but with the support of public opinion, such societies could do much to uplift the conditions of the people within their fields of action. They would better the sanitary condition of the Negro settlements, which even in the rural districts is uniformly very bad. They would make a beginning in various lines of improvement, as by furnishing simple

architectural plans for cottages, so that the blacks, and the lower class of whites as well, may have dwellings that contribute to the ordinary decencies of life. At a trifling net cost, which might not exceed three or four hundred dollars per annum, they could establish small model farms on the cotter scale, say of twenty or thirty acres in extent, where the people could see the advantages of good methods of tilling. Whenever a Negro man or woman rose above the herd he or she should be associated in this work. There could be no stronger incentive leading to advancement than the hope of joining such an association, and those so placed would be useful helpers, for they would greatly influence their class. It should not be supposed that it requires a large number of distinctly public-spirited people to found and maintain a betterment association. Experience shows that there as elsewhere one man or woman of leading quality leads, the others follow until the motive is established in the hearts of many, and the continuance of the work is assured.

I am so far convinced that the chance of betterment in the conditions of the Southern Negroes largely depends upon the institution of associations such as I have suggested, unions that have proved their value elsewhere, that I shall go a step further and consider the ways in which the work

may be begun. The main difficulty in the way of a beginning is to convince the class of people on which such work must fall of the advantages of the method. The Southerners are a conservative folk and look askance on innovations, especially when they come from the North. Therefore it seems well to begin the task by means of a little central association, composed of a few earnest persons from both North and South, which shall have for its purpose the fostering of such local improvement societies. This help should mainly consist of suggestions and advice to collaborators who are willing to work in particular fields. In time it would be advantageous if the central association could make small money grants to supplement the means gathered by the local societies for such expenses as would have to be met in founding model farms. Grants of this kind made by the State have proved in Massachusetts an effective means of furthering the establishment and maintenance of efficient agricultural societies. Although in general it will be well here, as in all other work of like nature, to trust mainly to local interest, it will be most likely advantageous to have these societies united with the central board meeting by delegates once each year. The cost of administering such an association would be but small, and the recompense perhaps greater than in

any other educational work called for by the states of the South.

Although it is, on many accounts, desirable that the abler Negroes come to be holders of land, it is important that no artificial inducements be offered to hasten this process, for it will bring with it a certain risk. The effect will be, in a measure, to withdraw the cotter class from that immediate contact with the whites to which we have to look for their further development. At present there is an intermediate condition which, on the whole, is advantageous. In this the Negro leases his land from a large proprietor and generally receives from him plows, seed, etc., and sometimes an advance payment in the way of food; at the end of the year the crop is divided between landlord and tenant. It is an ancient system, one much in use in the South before the Civil War, when the lease-holders were usually poor whites. In form it exactly corresponds to the metayer system, commonly found in Italy, save that there the relation becomes permanent and the holding passes onward to the eldest son of the tenant. From personal observation of these tenant farmers in Tuscany, I am satisfied that the method is on the whole better for them and for the land than the French system where the laborer owns the ground he tills. The fields are better cared for by

well-trained stewards than they would be by peasant proprietors, and the tenants keep in a wholesome friendly touch with a superior class. If this relation can be made such that the work of the Negro is thus well supervised, and he is at the same time secure in his tenancy, it will be more helpful to him than individual ownership can at present be.

There is evidently a tendency in the South to fence the Negro around with certain social barriers. This is commonly taken to indicate an immediate dislike to his color, features, and peculiar specific odor, which impress those who are not accustomed to his presence,—in fact, it arises from a natural desire to keep the two races socially apart. Within reasonable limits, this is advantageous to the interests of both races, for with the assumption that intermarriage is impossible it is clearly best to establish certain convenient lines of demarcation which shall show that the societies are to be separate. It is, however, desirable that these barriers be not made in the manner of those that limit the Hindu castes, where to touch another means pollution, but that they should be, like the other conventions of intercourse, left as far as may be to the good sense of individuals. It is, for instance, desirable to separate the blacks and whites in public conveyances, but I have been glad to see, even in the far South, that

where there was but one smoking car, the Negroes, if well-behaved, were allowed to sit with the whites.

At present some of the fanatical spirits of the South are much exercised over the matter of whites eating with the Negroes, and to judge from their fiery talk one would suppose that the preservation of the white race depended on making this vile and unnatural crime impossible. A little consideration of the matter should convince these people that they are unnecessarily disturbed. In the first place, if they were really the heirs of the ancient traditions of slave-holding days they would know that it was common enough then for the master's children to eat with the blacks and to slip away to some table in the quarter where they were sure of much more importance than at the family board. I remember having been well chastised when about twelve years of age for breaking the rule that I should no longer eat with the servants. This rule was not made to secure social distinction, for no one of the slave-holding class would have dreamed that there was such a need, but to prevent the child from retaining the Negro accent. In the South this evil had to be guarded against, as in England the matter of the Cockney forms of speech. In those days it would not have occurred to a gentleman to eat with a Negro any more than to ask a dirty white laborer in his

shirt sleeves to sit with him at table. The "poor whites" then, as now, held to this caste distinction as sacred. But as I knew that interesting ancient, the Southern gentleman, the only thing certain to have led him to "eat with a nigger" would have been the threat of being ostracized for the act.

There is a fair instance of the state of mind of the Southern aristocrat in the matter of eating with blacks, one that I commend to the attention of people who think they are striving to uphold the spirit of the olden days. When the commissioners charged with laying out the District of Columbia at the end of the eighteenth century came to do their task, they invited the almanac maker and surveyor, Banneker, who dwelt not far from the area, to take part in the work. Banneker was a full-blooded Negro, having been a slave in the family of the Elliots of Maryland, and it is said that when he purchased an annuity of his master he reckoned the price on a life table of his own computation. When, as they worked together, it came to dinner time, the commissioners asked their black guest to eat with them. He sensibly asked to eat apart. These commissioners were gentlemen from Virginia and Maryland; it is evident that the Negro by nature belonged in the same social class. So far as I have been able to find, this incident led to no public

comment; no one thought of blaming the white men for doing the obviously right thing.

It must not be supposed that this tendency to set off the Negroes as a caste is limited to the Southern States. It is quite as evident in the Northern part of this country and leads to some excesses not found in the South. I have been warned by an agent not to let a house in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to a worthy Negro, for the reason that it would gravely harm the property, and experience proved that the agent was right. I have known of a lady being requested not to bring her black waiting-maid to a Northern house where she was to visit, inquiry disclosing the reason to be that the owner would have to refurnish the room where the maid was to sleep. It is, in a word, evident that we are verging on the establishment of a most absurd custom by which we shall deny the very foundation of our modern life, the plain Christian, common-sense truth that our fellow-men are to be taken for what they are, and that they are not to be offended if we can spare them offense. It is not likely that any such caste system can be approved in this country, for the reason that the modern gentleman of the South, like his ancestors, is not a man to be dictated to; he does not like rules of conduct, and without his coöperation it will be impossible to establish this iniquity.

It is well to understand that the experiment of combining in a democratic society, in somewhere near equal numbers, two such widely separated races as the Aryans and Negroes, has never been essayed. Even under arbitrary governments the association of less discrepant folk has proved impracticable. Thus many peoples of Europe have found the Jews insufferable and have been willing to incur the losses their expulsion has brought about; within a decade Russia has taken this course. It may as well be confessed that a true democracy, social as well as political, is impossible in such conditions, and that any adjustment which may be effected must have many of the qualities of an oligarchy. There is some comfort in the knowledge that a complete democracy can be no more than an ideal in any modern state; it has never existed in any society large enough properly to be termed a state. In all effective commonwealths the control has resided in the few abler citizens who have shaped for the weaker masses. The main aim of our actual democracies is to give every man a chance to win as far as his capacities allow him to go, care being taken that his effort to get onward does not harm his neighbor or the commonwealth. As to the social status of the man, all but the most flagrant idealists hold that the state can take no account

of it. Moreover, the notion, originally French, that the male citizen has, by birthright, a rightful share in the political control of the commonwealth has not been generally accepted. Although most of the states of this Union have abolished, or not instituted, the qualification that electors should own property, this has not been done so much for the sake of justice as for expediency. Therefore the changes in the suffrage in the Southern States, and the further change introducing a property qualification for the franchise, which in my opinion will soon be required, though a departure from recent usage, will not be an innovation in our system of government. With a system in which the vote is given to blacks and whites alike on the basis of education and property, there is no reason why a trustworthy electorate cannot be obtained.

It should be observed that in the South at least there has never been any general objection on the part of white men to working with Negroes. In cotton mills and other like establishments where the operators are women and children such objection exists, and blacks are not tolerated there save to do the work of porters. But in the fields the two races have always worked together and do so to-day without any friction whatever. In certain instances the white man may work under the control of the black

and the relation excite no comment. Thus in a mining property in a Southern State, where iron ore is taken from open pits by contractors, I found a Negro "boss" supervising a gang in which there were several white men, one of them known to me as an ex-Confederate soldier of decayed gentleman stock. I asked the superintendent of the property if the relation had led to any trouble. He said that I was the first person who had spoken of it to him, though it had existed for some weeks. With the ordinary business relations between the men of the two races well established, it should be a matter of no difficulty for them to unite their action in the business of government. This union, indeed, now effectively exists. The so-called Democratic party of the South, really the aristocratic party there, has never hesitated to coöperate in citizenly work with the Negroes. Unless the caste insanity should go far, we may trust the good sense of the people to maintain this wholesome relation. With this arrangement the first stage of the commonwealth's work can be accomplished.

When it comes to the matter of holding public office, we find ourselves in face of the worst evidence of the caste feeling that has appeared. Men who are willing to work with the Negro in the fields and in caucuses and to welcome him at the ballot-

box are disposed to deny him all share of the other service to the State in legislatures or offices filled by appointment or election. It is not likely that this limitation will commend itself to the sober judgment of the Southern people. If the Negro is to be given rights in the political work of the commonwealth at all, and it is not openly proposed to withhold the franchise if he meets the tests, then there can be no just limitation of those rights on account of his race. As regards all political offices, whether filled by election or appointment, he should in justice stand equally with the white man, on the basis of the choice of the electorate or the judgment of the appointing and confirming power. To take any other ground than this is to traverse either our birthright or our sense of justice.

I note in the debates concerning certain recent Federal appointments of Negroes that some of the critics of those appointments take the ground that they are properly objectionable to the whites, in that they bring them into intimate relations with Negroes. I know something of the necessary relations with the two groups of public servants, postmasters and revenue officers, and know that they are far less intimate than those I have had with blacks who served me in other ways. I cannot imagine a Southern gentleman really offended by the contacts he is

required to have with such functionaries, though I can well conceive that he would dislike a system which gave such places of honor or profit to the inferior race and not to his own. I am convinced, however, that if he has not lost his ancient sense of political expediency he will if it be necessary accept this situation because of the hard logic that supports it. It may be said, on the other hand, that the appointment of Negroes to office is fitly to be regarded as of doubtful expediency in any community where a strong dislike to their presence in positions of control exists. If, for any reason, however ill-judged, a white or a black man offends a notable part of the people while an equally good man of another color would offend none, the unobjectionable man should be chosen. In other words, it is no part of the business of a government to educate people in matters of prejudice, and any effort to attain this end is likely to increase the evil it tries to remedy. It may be said that to deny a black man an appointment, because he is black, is to recognize the inequality established by prejudices; but we have to accept such inequalities, much as we may regret them. We do so when a foreign court refuses to receive an American minister who is a Jew, though the court may do wrong to reject the man on that account. The Southern whites do wrong to contend

against the appointment of a worthy Negro to a Federal office, but it appears to me also an error of judgment to put officials in places where their presence will prove exasperating to any part of the people, be they white or black. The safe course is to wait for the time of reason which is sure to come to men.

The main point of my contention is that it is necessary to avoid the existing risk of developing a caste difference between the Negroes and the Aryans. In every country class differences must exist, and they inevitably tend to become great. Yet amongst us, as in the slave-holding days, the conditions need not prevent good human relationships from existing between the two races, as a caste barrier does, but may, by affirming the social interval, make the development of understandings easier and more helpful to both races. If political disturbances are avoided there is good reason to hope that these widely diverse peoples will, in part because of their diversity, come into accord. This accord will be more speedily attained if the steps leading to it are left to be taken without much discussion, so that the adjustment be as by a natural process. I should, indeed, be glad if the whole matter could for a time pass out of public debate, leaving aside the settlement of all details until the main need of bringing

the two races into spontaneous citizenly coöperation had been accomplished.

The few and scanty suggestions that I have felt able to make concerning the Negro problem should not lead the reader to suppose that it is simple and to be easily solved. It is clearly not only the most difficult our race has encountered, but of an order of difficulty that has never been met in any other commonwealth. There is in it an age of vexation and trial, and doubtless much of failure, before a wholesome solution can be attained ; the costs already incurred may be manifolded before we are done. Yet I am not with those who lament that this burden is laid upon us, for I see that in bearing it we may win to station such as no people has attained. I believe that the capacity to deal with this matter is in the Southern people. They did a like work when they took the various stocks of Africans as savages and shaped their slavery so that those peoples were swiftly lifted to a far better moral estate than they have acquired elsewhere, making them, as we know by the best of proof, their friends, while they in turn gained from the task a quality as men and citizens such as is won only by faithful service to high aims. I know that they met in the Civil War the gravest crises of modern times with a valiant devotion. I differed with them in purpose, but share

with all men in admiration of their devotion to what they saw to be their duty. I believe, moreover, that much of what these Southern people retained of the race strength, and what of enlarged powers was added to it, was due to the generations of care for the primitive folk who had been committed to their hands. The burden of the future is great, but there are men to shoulder it.

Let me urge the point, that in considering the patent ills of slavery we have generally overlooked the good the institution wrought to master and slave alike: it lifted a savage race nearer and more rapidly towards civilization than had ever before been accomplished, and it gave to the people who did the work a peculiar moral training. We all recognize the effect of leadership, of mastering and guiding inferiors; we see its effects on parents, on captains of every kind, and know that a man grows by his care of others. As I remember the elders of the slaveholding class, I recall something of their occasional brutality and much of the odd mixture of degradation and splendor which characterized them, but the strongest impression is of men and women who were sorely burdened by the grave responsibility of keeping their hosts of semi-savages in decent ways so that they might live Christian lives. I see that where there was the struggle to accomplish this dif-

ficult task the Southern family held its place; where it was lacking it became debased and fell into the unhappy state of the decayed gentry class. I recognize that in no other social condition was the survival of the fittest so evident as in slave-holding, and that as a result it developed a body of natural leaders, strong men who had won their way by quality of leadership handed down from generation to generation.

The result of these conditions of slavery is that we have in the South a body of men who are fitted to take charge of a situation which is not very different from that their fathers met. They are now, indeed, dealing with it in a fairly effective manner, for despite all the rumors of class wars, the occasional shocking incidents of lynch law, and the abominations of the peonage system in Alabama, the South is at this moment laborious and prosperous, perhaps more so than any other part of the world. These leaders of inherited captaincy are effectively and silently at work. They have no more desire to reëstablish slavery than have the sons of the abolitionists, for they see that the Negro is a cheaper economical agent as a free man than he was as a slave. I know many of these men well, and their only purpose is to make the best of the existing social order with no thought of return to the old. I am con-

vinced that if the proposition to restore slavery could be submitted to the whites of the South it would not obtain one per cent of the white vote. It is to these men of the class educated in the management of the Negroes that we have to look for the work to be done. Personally I look to them for the doing with great confidence, for what the forefathers have shown of political wisdom may fairly be expected from the sons. In my opinion the task has to be left in their hands with such slight help as the people of the North can lend, not by legislation, but out of sympathy.

The need of abandoning Federal legislation concerning the Negroes has, at length, after a generation of blundering, become apparent to our people, as is evident from the neglect of a Republican Congress to go further on the mistaken way. Each of those enactments which were intended to help the Negro onward has served to hinder his advance, for the reason that they have diverted him from his immediate duties and filled his mind with hopes of some vague beneficence that was to better his lot. Like all primitive folk, the Negro tends to look afar in this world or the next for some miracle that may help him out of all his troubles. The Civil War and the Act of Emancipation have naturally led him to believe that the Federal Government had god-like

powers, and that having lately made him free it would soon make him rich. They have still the dream that the land is to be divided amongst them, each to have forty acres, a horse, a cow, and a litter of pigs duly provided. White rogues have nourished this fancy to their profit; some years ago I heard of one who sold to Negroes in Alabama at five dollars each several carloads of gaily painted stakes such as are used in the game of croquet, assuring them that they were to be used to mark the corners of these farms dropped from the sky. So long as this delusion of help from afar infects the minds of the blacks it will be impossible to bring them to the plain hard work which they have to do, or to reconcile them to the business of keeping on good terms with their white neighbors.

Some of my readers are likely to find in what I have said of the relations between the Negroes and whites of the South a remnant of the old slave-holding view of the matter. I agree with them in this judgment. I have, indeed, ventured on this writing for the reason that while I am of the group of Southerners who held for the abolition of slavery, I see the good that was in it and the good which may be hoped from the training it gave to whites and blacks alike. I see, however, because I have studied the Negro long and carefully, that he is not of a race that can

yet stand alone, and doubt if he can ever so stand in a civilization maintained by himself. I would not have it supposed that I dislike or condemn the Negroes, on the contrary, I am very much attached to them, for I find that they are in their simple human nature as likable a people as my own. They have, indeed, more qualities which on first contact arouse the sympathies. While they differ in certain important ways from the whites, they are, as a whole, very human; they show the general qualities of mankind better than our own race, where the primitive sympathetic nature is too often overladen by the higher reason. I believe that in the Negro, this relatively simple species of our genus, we have a creature which can with care be so placed in a modern state that it will not seriously weaken its structure, and may add much to the richness of its life. On the other hand, if the Negroes do not come into and remain in accord with the whites they may endanger the Republic. With the care of the abler race they will make good citizens; without that they will give us the conditions of the Haytian folk.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CATEGORIC MOTIVE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

IT is commonly supposed that the process of classification is of a recondite nature to be used only in learned inquiries. It is, in fact, a necessary part of all thinking, and is more trusted to by untrained simple minds than by those whose thoughts are of a higher order. This desire for classification which I shall, for brevity, term the *categoric motive*, is recognizable in the lower animals, as well as in man. When a brute, as for instance a horse, sees a large moving object which is unfamiliar, he is at once frightened, and this for the reason that he has by ages of ancestral experience learned to form a group or category of such objects which it is profitable to be afraid of, for the reason that enemies lie in that group. If the thing is a sheet of paper blown by the wind, or an automobile, and the creature is forced to encounter it often, he will form a new category, or rather a subdivision of the old, of moving things with the particular features belonging to the paper or the horseless carriage, of which the individuals

are not harmful. Of course, all this process of categorizing objects performed by the lower animals, and by lower man as well, is done without a trace of consciousness of what they are about. They do it after the manner of untrained men, for the reason that it is the only way in which intelligence can deal with the practically infinite number and variety of things that come to its attention. They have to divide these presentations of the universe into groups, those that may include enemies, those in which their species belong, those good to eat, etc., etc., and neglect all the rest as in no wise concerning them. The groups which are important to them are evidently subdivided, so that they hold quite a variety of genera and species in their limited minds.

When we observe the instinctive categoric motive in man, we find that it works exactly as in the vertebrates of lowlier estate, with the difference that it is much more important, leading to the construction of far more divisions and to a better definition of them. Thus while a horse has probably not more than a score of categories, the lowliest savage cannot do his work with his fellows or with the world without, it may be, a thousand of them. Each of these categories is represented in his mind by a type, usually a composite image made from his various seeings of objects included in it. Naturally,

but not necessarily, there is a word or phrase by which the group may be called to mind. It is easy to see that success in life, in savage as in beast, depends upon the sufficiency of these categories. They must contain what needs be known for success and no more; they must be sharp, clear, and to the point; else some enemy, man or beast, not properly included, may slay him, or some improperly classified plant, unhappily categorized as good for eating, may poison him. In fact, I fear that some of my excessively Darwinian friends will, if they happen to note these statements, proceed at once to show that the survival of man has depended altogether on the fitness of his categories. I am myself inclined to think that the ability to classify effectively has had a considerable share in the myriad influences which have given our genus its marvelous success.

Assuming then the point that man does his thinking largely by the aid of his categories, let us note certain features which necessarily characterize these groups. First let us remark that in no case do these mental pictures approach accuracy. Even the naturalist, who with all his skill and patience sets down his description of a species, knows that he has done no more than describe certain salient points of the group; he is well aware that a life-time of observation on a single group would leave the task incom-

plete. In our ordinary categories we evidently include no more than experience teaches us to do, which is to regard only what immediately concerns us. Here and there a wise man, and his is the supreme task of wisdom, sets to work to widen the scope of his categories, particularly those which relate to mankind. With the common folk, the categories into which they fit the kinds of men are as gross as the others, such as may be denoted by good or bad; my sort or other sort, savage or civilized, Jew, "nigger," gentleman, and by scores of other words by which for our rude purposes we divide up our fellow-men.

When a category has been made it is thereafter recalled by some striking feature or features which can be easily seized on by eye or other senses, and becomes, so to say, the label of the thing, one that can be seen at a distance and one not likely to be mistaken. Thus the color of the skin is sufficient to categorize the Negro, or the shape of the nose the Jew. It does not seriously matter that an Arab may be blacker than a true African; for the reason that all these groups have to be made in a rough-and-ready way there is no time or skill for finished work. The main point being not so much to exclude all that should be put out, but to include all that by any chance should go in. Thus, for instance, it

is better for a horse in the wilds to shy at many an innocuous object than to have the category of dangerous things insufficient in its extent. So with men it is safer in the various groups of enemies to include objects that are not inimical, rather than to leave any dangers out. So it comes to pass that with the primitive man all others than his own tribe are counted as enemies, or, with ourselves, all who are black are reckoned as of one kind. The result is that nearly all these groups which are the bases of our thinking are taken as indicating universal likeness among the included objects, while in fact they may denote only some relatively unimportant feature which conveniently serves as a sign of the category.

As soon as a category is established in the observational way there begin to accumulate about it certain emotional qualities; the states of mind aroused by contact with the things included in the group come to be associated with the name of it. This is true of inanimate objects, but it is vastly more true of the categories we form of men. There the traditional and literary impulses serve to gather about the name of a human group a body of emotions which awake when the word is spoken and which prevent any change in its connotation. Thus it is that such terms as Jew, "nigger," and the like

become barriers to sympathetic advance. They are to common people insuperable obstacles to further understanding of the facts, and even to persons of well-trained minds they are hard to clear away, for they are founded not alone on human nature, but on that of all intelligence of man and brute. It is not too much to say that all social advance intimately depends on the extent to which we may be able to break down these ancient barriers and reconstruct our primitive classifications in the light of inquiry.

With this brief account of the categorizing motive in mind, let us look at certain of its applications to the matter we have in hand. Taking our common idea of any group of men, let us see how it affects our relations to them. For this end our American Indians will serve well as an example. If we examine into what comes to mind when the name of the people is spoken, or better what is awakened by the sight of a member of this race, we shall find that the image is relatively simple and that it is made up of traditional views as to the nature of the creature; the stories of forays and massacres with perhaps bits of memory of gentler tales. If one has dwelt among Indians these emotions and judgments are qualified by personal experience which leads to some amendment of the popular view. In all cases,

however, the state of mind is determined mainly by tradition and not by personal experience. Thus when you think you are dealing with a particular red man, while you behold him with your outer eyes as an individual, you inwardly see in him little else than what the category sets forth. He is the traditional Indian for all that his personality should tell us. He is seen as belonging to a species of men which is pretty much the same from one end of the American continents to the other ; they are all to be treated in the same way for the reason that they are all Indians.

Turn now to what we know of the facts, and compare them with this gross category made as rudely as the brutes make them. We know that the native tribes of this continent differ among themselves far more than do the peoples of Europe. These differences are marked in language by the existence of many score stocks, each apparently of origins so separate that it is more than possible that they were separately invented at different points by men who were originally without speech. In customs the variety is nearly as great. In traditions they are equally far apart. In quality of mind, in general ability and particular powers, they differ even more than do the Sicilians and Scandinavians, and among the members of the several tribes the indi-

vidual quality of the persons, as regards all that makes for nobility, is like what we find among acquaintances of our own race. Yet knowing all this, such is the dominating power of the categorizing habit that the Indian, unless I hold myself up to my knowledge, appears to me as he does to the frontiersman as that kind of man who is good when he is dead. So it is in all our contacts with our fellow-men; we have inherited from the lower life, that of the brutes and brutal man, a habit which leads to a classification of our kind, embodying hatreds as animal in their nature as those which exist between dogs and foxes — such categories as are labelled “Vile Jew” and the like.

In the history of the relation of our people to the American Indians we see some of the more evident consequences of this evil of the category. In the presence of this vastly diverse body of the indigenous folk there was need of action very diverse in its nature and aims, but inevitably the category of redskin was applied to them all, and there was but one general method of dealing with them devised. The contents of the category were of the simplest, including no more than the ideas that all redskins were lazy, treacherous, and menacing, therefore to be put out of the way. So it has been in all man's dealings with men of other races or tribes or classes.

His classification has been the cloak of ignorance, giving a false sense of certainty as to the basis of action. So it is to-day in our own society, and will be until the process of enlargement of men leads them beyond this limitation. The way to this new and as yet unwon freedom is plain. It is through the extension of the sympathies and understandings to the point where we shall look upon all men as individuals, as we now look upon our lovers, our children, and our friends. It is only through knowledge led by the affections that the animal categoric way of treating our fellows can be destroyed, and the mind made ready to behold mankind from the larger human point of view. To attain this was an evident aim of Christ. To those who may endeavor to practice the art of Christian relations with the fellow-man it is well to give a caution which I have noted more in detail in the chapter on human contacts. This is, that in the presence of the fellow-man we have ever to contend with the ancient, inherited, categoric method of dealing with the fellows of our kind. It is one of the hardest of all moral undertakings to keep from being controlled by this inheritance, so that we may deal with the fellow, not as a mere man with no more than his trifling value in the classification, but as our brother in life — seeing in him ourselves.

There can be no question that the tendency to displace the categoric view of man by the sympathetic is principally moral. It is equally beyond doubt that it is the most essential element in all true religions. It is also clear that there is some grave hindrance which makes it difficult to put in practice views which have been perfectly accepted by the intelligence, and which command a large measure of support from the emotions. Many a man has found that his resolutions to deal with his neighbor largely, and in the manner of the Samaritan, fall away when he is in face of the need. What appears to him in his closet as a living change of heart and of mind disappears in the commonplace situation of dealing with the first ill-conditioned fellow he meets, so he comes to the conclusion that the higher view is fanciful and impracticable. The real difficulty lies in the fact that the categoric motive is very deeply rooted, and from its nature tends to command in certain situations so strongly that nothing but a firm will combined with much practice can change the habitual conditions of contact. What is necessary is that we take with us in meeting the neighbor a determination to look upon him considerately, in the light of our bettered understanding.

It is mightily interesting, as well as profitable beyond account, to enter determinedly on this practice

of the sympathetic understanding through what, as in all unaccustomed arts, has to be at first a deliberate exercise of the will. There need be no fear that the process will lead to a self-conscious mode of dealing with our fellow-men, for sympathy will cure that and lead us to forget ourselves. Whoever will essay this task will be surprised to find how differently the fellow-man appears in the new light; how changed indeed is the whole world with the old scales fallen from our eyes. There are no more common people, "dogs of Jews," or "Indians good when they are dead," but each stands before us in the dignity of his manhood as a presentation of the hundred million years of life of this world summed in that marvelous personality of man. Whoever sees this in his fellow has seen into the promised land; he has in a true sense gained religion.

It is not to be supposed that the enthusiasm of humanity which comes with the first consciousness of what man is when the ancient categoric limits are swept away, will endure. It is the nature of such impulses to be transient, but there will remain an enlargement of motive in human intercourse which is of great and permanent value. This aggrandizement, however, is not limited to the understanding of our kind, but insensibly extends to all our ways of looking at the world. Having broken down the

ancient cramping walls that limited our conceptions in the human field, all the other like prisons of our thoughts tend to weaken and give the sympathies a chance to enter.

Looked at from a naturalist's point of view all these changes I have described appear to me to be the results of a widening of those affections which are first shown in this world by the love of the mother for her offspring and which have spontaneously extended to the brethren, to the tribe, and thence, in widening circles of influence, to mankind and to the realm of nature. What understanding does is to enforce that motive, to support it by knowledge and place it safely on its way of development. In this work it is but the guide of that love which is past understanding.

CHAPTER IX

THE CONDITIONS OF THE CONTACTS OF MEN

IN the preceding pages I have often had to advert to the conditions of human contact. As this matter is of fundamental importance I shall now consider it in some detail, though I shall limit the consideration to those features which relate to matters of our inquiry. As we shall see, these carry us rather far.

The most important point to be kept in mind is that men are strikingly individual beings, each separated from his fellows by gulfs that are hard to bridge, and which, for all the efforts to obliterate them, remain deep and wide. I have elsewhere discussed this matter in much detail.¹ We now need do no more than note that this individual quality of man is but the summit of a series of natural actions by which the universe as we know it has come to be made up of separate units, each with its own distinct life reacting on other centres of various grades. In man we have the last and highest of the series of

¹ See *The Individual, a study of life and death*, by N. S. Shaler, D. Appleton & Co.

individuals of which the atom or the atomule is the lowest of which we know anything whatever. In man we have a vast host of subordinated individuals, atoms, molecules, etc., as well as semi-independent organic forms like the several organs and the white corpuscles of the blood, all united in the bodily activities which constitute his animal life. In his spiritual life we have a host of faculties, activities, and latencies which only in some very small share originated with him, but have been accumulated in all the life of his predecessors in perhaps a hundred thousand species, and individuals innumerable since his life began with the lowliest organism. All this vast inheritance along with his own trifling experience is here for the moment working together and striving to play a part through contacts with the environment, particularly by means of intercourse with the fellow-man. So when we exchange greetings with the neighbor, we and he are trying to bring our essentially parted natures into contact. He is seeking to convey a sense of himself to us, as we are to send our own self to him. But across the gulf that parts us there is no bridge by which we can really enter to one another.

Wherever we behold the life of creatures allied to ourselves, the mammals and birds, we find them continually engaged in an effort to come to an un-

derstanding with the neighbors of their kind by means of sympathetic calls, gestures, or fondlings; they, too, are trying to escape from the loneliness which is the sore burden of individuality. They probably succeed far better, relatively, than man, for the reason that they have little save a narrow range of emotions to exchange; the needed sympathy can be aroused by mere sounds or gestures; the signals of kinship can be sent back to them by the same simple means. With man it is different; not only is the scope of his emotional life really far greater than in the lower species, but there is an indefinitely wide range of ideas, more or less mingled with emotions, which demand expression as a means of inducing that sympathetic motive which he would arouse in the kinsman.

To set forth his state of mind to the neighbor, man is engaged in ceaseless endeavors. He has invented thousands of languages and words innumerable for no other purpose save to bridge the gulf between these fearfully remote neighbors. He contrives dances and pageants, creates sculpture and painting, makes endless plays and stories, all in the ancient effort to come near to his kind.

Supposing that we have thus formed a picture, which at best remains most imperfect, of the strange isolation and loneliness of the individual man, let us

see what are the means at his command for gaining access to his neighbor. By inheritance from the lower life he has help from certain cries and a few expressive gestures. As a man he has a face that may tell much more than the countenances of the lower animals, and yet nothing beyond the emotions and only a few of these in a clear manner. For the part of him that is essentially man he has only the device of language. That is for some portions of the task of bridging the gulf a marvelous instrument; even with the lower peoples its value greatly exceeds that of all the other means of intercourse put together; yet it conveys slowly, and is, as we readily see, most ineffective when the need of communicating with the neighbor is greatest.

Let us now consider what takes place when two men, mere strangers to one another, come together. The motive of classification, which I have considered in another chapter, leads each of them at once to recognize the approaching object first as living, then as human. The shape and dress carry the categorizing process yet further, so that they are placed in groups, as of this or that tribe or social class, and as these determinations are made they arouse the appropriate sympathies or hatreds such as by experience have become associated with the several categories. Be it observed that these judgments are

spontaneous, instinctive, and unnoticed. They are made so by immemorial education in the art of contact which man has inherited from the life of the ancestral beasts and men; they have most likely been in some measure affirmed by selection, for these determinations as to the nature of the neighbor were in the lower stages of existence in brute and man of critical importance, the creatures lived or died according as they determined well or ill, swiftly or slowly. If we observe what takes place in our own minds at such meetings we will see that the action in its immediateness is like that of the eyelids when the eye is threatened. As we say, it is done before we know it.

So far, in our contact with the fellow-man what takes place is of animal generality, not essentially human; the next steps are of the higher order, for they enter on the field of actions peculiar to our genus. The stranger tries by speech to tell us of his thought; if his language is our own and he is clever in using it we may get something from the words which qualifies in a measure the idea of him that the categorizing process forced on us; but if we note carefully we shall see that this amendment is slight. Our preconceived idea, as of Jew or Negro, effectively denies him access to us. From the tones of the voice or the expression of the face or body may

come something to awaken sympathy, but rarely from the sense conveyed by the speech. All the ideas we thus receive are faint and of little weight, compared with what we gain by the more ancient tests as to the category in which the man belongs. Moreover, speech is at best a clumsy instrument for conveying thought ; even in the written form, where everything can be well judged and amended at will, it is most imperfect. Thus what I am here writing, fairly well trained as I am in such work, and with time to turn and weigh the phrase, will fail to bear to the reader precisely what I would send to him. The spoken words of strangers, as we easily note, are very ineffective in communicating any but the simplest ideas ; they have relatively little value in arousing sympathy except so far as they do so by the quality of the voice or the intonation.

If I have made the point plain, we may now assume that in meeting the fellow-man for the first time we take with us habits of mental action which gravely limit the probability of penetrating to his quality. We instinctively put him into a category or group of preconceived ideas of what he should be, and thus lodged he is apt to be beyond the reach of our higher sympathies. We do this, as before said, because the methods of contact were determined in our lower life of beast and man. The question now is, what

can be done so far to destroy this inherited evil that our sympathies in the presence of the neighbor may operate as they do when we endeavor by the stimulus of literature, religion, or music to awaken the sympathetic motives we would have with us when in face of the fellow-man. Evidently the first thing to do is to study the art of approaching this isolation to which we would come near. Men have long, in a dumb way, recognized that there was need of such a process; they have here and there developed fragments of what will doubtless some day be made into a whole, but so far as I know there has been no effort to discuss the matter of meeting the neighbor from the point of view of philosophy or of morals. This lack makes it difficult in the brief space I can give to this problem effectively to discuss it. What I have to say should therefore be taken as mere suggestions based mainly on my own observations and experiments.

In considering the possible ways by which we may better our contacts with our neighbors, it is well to begin by taking account of the present state of the process of intercourse, to see if in the existing essentially instinctive methods there is any chance of effecting improvements. It seems to me that much can be done in this field of action. In the first place it is evident that the primal methods of appeal to

the neighbor for sympathy, those of gesture, voice, tone, and facial expression, no longer serve as they primitively did to bridge the gulf between men. If we watch our collateral kinsmen, the monkeys, we see that before our ancestors came to man's estate they trusted to grimace and gesture to convey emotions, and by those means much was conveyed. It is still the custom of the lower races to use these silent means of awakening sympathy. The unconscious habit of imitating the antics of their kindred among the mammals and birds probably exhibits a low stage of gesture language, for in that way the creature puts itself in the same state of mind as its fellow and gives him proof of it. This means of sympathetic communication by movements of the body passes from the lower life to man, and in the more primitive races and in the children of the higher is much used to signify and excite the sympathetic state. Curiously enough, however, it tends among all peoples in their social advance to undergo certain changes which effectively destroy its value as a means of intercourse. These changes deserve the attention which I shall now give them.

The first step towards the loss of gesture language appears to arise from the fact that it is made formal, becoming what we call the dance, or it may be organized into a distinct sign language, such as was once

in use among the American Indians. Either of these specializations tends to take gesture out of association with speech. Thus with our Indians, though they have dances made by gesture most symbolic, and a sign language far more perfect than any other described, the ordinary speech is singularly monotonous and without much help from grimace or gesture. With the higher races the same effect is produced by the relegation of these ancient means of expression to the stage when the actions had become recognized as appropriate. Such things become the properties of the actor, and any use of them save on the stage is regarded as unfit. Even oratory, which once retained its ancient rights of free expression, is now deprived of them; to say that a public speaker behaves like an actor is to condemn him. The curious motive of *tabu* common with men of primitive folk is perhaps immediately responsible for this banishment of a most important contrivance for establishing relations with our fellows.

Something of the motive which has led to the abandonment of gesture is probably to be found in desire of people of culture for exemption from bodily contact with their neighbors, even when these are their friends. The desire for this physical isolation is such that no cultivated person can stand a slap on the back or a punch in the ribs, though both are in

the gesticulative language natural and very effective means of communication. So, too, the modesty which desires to have no public excitation of the sexual motives counts for something in this repression, as does also the bashfulness which is in the same field of emotions. It is likely that the modern ideal of the soldier, that of a rigid unemotional man, has had its influence in making all our movements formal and mechanical. In fact there is doubtless a great tangle of influences which have served to make the original man, who was evidently a very gesticulative creature, into the speaking machine he now is in his best estate. If we watch a group of Negroes in the South, where they are free to put aside their semblance of the whites, we may see something of the ancient spontaneous sign language and note how much of sympathy-conveying power has been lost by the civilizing process.

The change in the dumb speech of gesture has its parallel in the formalizing process which the voice has undergone. We no longer permit its tones to tell much of our feelings. Social custom requires that it shall be kept as far as possible on one key, whatever be the significance of the words it utters. Here again, it is only the actor who has the ancient scope, even the orator is condemned if he is disposed to put much sympathetic quality in his voice;

he is apt, if he does so, to be regarded as theatrical. It is only in children that we find the perfectly natural tones that fit with the emotion, but these pass quickly as the imitative impulse leads them to shape their habits of speech on those of their elders. This change occurs in all peoples, but is most conspicuous in the more civilized moderns, where the expression of emotion has become in some measure shameful.

As regards the expression of the countenance, the rule of least action has gone even further than in the case of the other elements of dumb language. There can be no doubt that the qualities of the face were made for expression; there are several sets of muscles which are so connected with expressive facial movements that we may fairly regard their survival, if not their existence, to have been due to the use that has been made of them for this purpose; in the primitive men they usually have an extended and free play. We see this mobility still in the Negroes when merriment, dejection, and other states of mind give rise to a far greater variation of expression than in the whites,—it appears to me to be several times as great,—though it is habitually restrained, that it may conform to white usage. In the present condition of civilized peoples the face is so far controlled that it has lost nearly all of its power to influence in first contacts with the

fellow-man, so that even the trained observer finds little to interpret in its play. This is even more true of the Hebrew face than of that of the Aryan; they both have what seems to be the inevitable mask of civilization, but the Jew masks best. So far has this abandonment of facial gesture gone, that even actors appear to me to be abandoning the use of the face as a means of influencing their audiences.

The rule that excludes dumb speech has gone so far that a man must no longer weep save in profound personal grief. To weep because another is affected would seem to most men a sign of weakness. If he can do so, the civilized man takes the sorest blow unmoved. As regards laughter, it is still tolerated because it is the least controllable of the sympathetic movements. Yet it, too, is limited. We rarely hear from a cultivated man a real laugh, but only a mockery of that most human movement. It is likely that with a little further advance we shall conquer this, the last surviving of the primitive modes of expression, and be reduced to mere words uttered in such a manner as may best convey their intellectual meaning.

My reason for dwelling on the loss of the original means of communicating with the fellow-being is that these means, mostly originating below man, are the most natural resources whereby one being can

come in contact with another. We see how primal they are when we note our intercourse with dogs. These creatures watch our gestures, expressions, and tones of voice in the primitive way, and from them obtain marvellously clear notions of our states of mind. We are accustomed to use these grimaces and gesticulations in dealing with them, so that one can see and hear the natural man more clearly when he is dealing with his dog than at any other time. There was evidently a stage in human intercourse before speech began, when all that one man said to another was told as we tell it to a dog, by movements and tones, and the understanding was doubtless quickly sympathetic even though very unintellectual. The reactions of spirit were effective because they were ancient and deeply founded. Then came this device of articulate speech, with the chance it gave to convey, not the ancient emotion, but discreet, accurately stated thought. This method of communication must at first have been to a very great extent combined with the earlier mode of expression, for speech grew slowly to language in the sense in which we know it. But in time words became so effective that they alone might serve. The effect of this change is that when we come to parley with the stranger we have no means of bridging the gulf between us save the very unsym-

pathetic device of phrase, and this of the arid conventional type. I bid him "good morning," ask the time, comment on the weather, or what not, and go my way ; so far as any sympathetic contact with that isolation is concerned, it has not taken place. As I have to form some opinion of him I do it by putting him in one of the categories or groups of men which are the common property of my race and class, so that what comes to me is little more than this empty form on which judgments are shaped.

It is something if we recognize these limitations of our first contacts with men, and make due correction for their utter insufficiency. It is more if we change the state of mind in which these contacts are made, and acquire habits which may wake us out of the commonplace humor with which we meet the neighbor. I have found by experience that this is possible. For all that the fellow is trying as hard as I am or harder, to hide himself in the citadel of himself, he really longs to escape from his isolation. He will resent any effort to break open his gates, but after the manner of warders he is not likely to object to a parley which will establish something like human relations without the slow process of siege. Experiment shows that the surest way to this is by a frank, neighborly greeting that goes at once beyond the outworks of the hold. I had my lesson

in this way years ago, when, on a railway train, a stranger, an intelligent man, entered to me and went straight about discussing a rather recondite question as if our conversation had been temporarily interrupted. In a moment my surprise vanished, and we were as near together as though I had known him for years. The subject exhausted, I questioned him as to the manner of his greeting. He said that he had deliberately adopted it as a means of getting quickly near to men, and that it worked well ; now and then it made a man "huffy," but such a fellow was not worth knowing.

It is not everybody who has the address to practice the art of instantaneous friendliness in the manner above noted, but all can train themselves in what is perhaps a more effective way of bettering the contact with the neighbor. This is by insisting that we shall be interested in him. In place of allowing him to step by essentially unnoticed, scan him so that you will know him again. Be sure that in that little field of his countenance there is a history worth reading. See his shape and what it tells ; you will be mistaken in many things, but the most you discern will be true. Above all, remember that here before you is the supreme product of this world, the most marvellous thing we know in the universe, — a man.

The history of the methods of meeting and greeting shows that there has been a steady decline in the formal part of the performance, but, as we get an idea of it from the old plays, the aim of the ancient formality was very generally that of display. It may well be doubted whether it provided any better method of approach to the neighbor than the abbreviated greetings of to-day, save that it kept people longer under preliminary survey, so that they had a better chance to judge one another. But under the conditions of human nature all such actions become familiarized and commonplace, and there is no use trying to give them spiritual significance after they have lost it. The only way to improve the conditions of human contacts is by a deliberate change in the point of view. This is difficult, but so far attainable that we may hope to do much in this way.

As for the details of this process of bettering the conception of the fellow-man so that our present barren categories in which we include the varieties of men we meet may be enlarged, it is clear that the end can only be attained by extending knowledge of the nature of man. Just so far as the commonplace ideas which we habitually use can be replaced by something nearer to what we now know to be the truth, we shall provide a basis for better

relations. Yet these facts of modern science which so magnify our concepts of humanity are in themselves mere information. Taken alone they can do no more to change the point of view than our knowledge of the physical realm serves to alter our everyday state of mind concerning the weather or stars. In his ordinary seeing of these spheres the wisest student of nature does not perceptibly differ from the person who is uninformed in such matters: it is only when his sympathetic imagination quickens the heap of information that he sees widely and far.

I cannot here enter on the large question as to the ways in which the deeper and most real value of modern knowledge can be won through its association with the imagination. It may be said, however, that this will have to be accomplished by the passage of this pure learning into the spiritual channels of religion and literature. The results of inquiry are now, and in their present condition must remain, spiritually inert to the masses of men, as they are, indeed, to the greater number of the investigators who possess them. It is not to be hoped or even desired that this body of knowledge shall become a part of the store that all men share. It is, in fact, quite beyond possibility that as information it can be appropriated by any one man, however

able and laborious he may be. But in the converted form of religious beliefs and poetic understandings, the more enlarging of these truths, especially those relating to humanity, may find their place in the minds of men. There appears to be no chance that the betterment will be attained by any formal teaching of science; of that there is now more than enough; for science is evidently displacing those forms of education which helped to quicken the imaginative sympathies of men on which all truly humane culture depends.

With this view as to the conditions of human contact, particularly of what occurs when men first meet one another, let us glance at what takes place in nearer intercourse. We have seen that at the beginning of any acquaintance the fellow-being is inevitably dealt with in the categoric way. He is taken as a member of a group, which group is denoted to us by a few convenient signs; as our acquaintance with a particular person advances, this category tends to become qualified. Its bounds are pushed this way and that until they break down. It is to be noted in this process that the category fights for itself, or we for it, so that the result of the battle between the immediate truth and the prejudice is always doubtful. It is here that knowledge, especially that gained by individual experience, is most

helpful. The uninformed man, who begins to find, on the nearer view of an Israelite, that the fellow is like himself, holds by his category in the primitive way. The creature *is* a Jew, therefore the evidence of kinship must not count. He who is better informed is, or should be, accustomed to amend his categories. He may, indeed, remember that he is dealing with a neighbor of the race which gave us not only Christ, but all the accepted prophets who have shaped our own course, and his understanding helps to cast down the barriers of instinctive prejudice.

At the stage of advancing acquaintance where friendship is attained, the category begins to disappear from our minds. We may, indeed, measure the advance in this relation by the extent to which it has been broken down. Looking attentively at our mental situation as regards those whom we know pretty well, we see that most of them are still, though rather faintly, classified into groups. While a few of the nearer stand forth by themselves, all of the nearest to our hearts are absolutely individualized, so that our judgments of them are made on the basis of our own motives and what we of ourselves discern. We may use categoric terms concerning our lovers, spouses, or children, but they have no real meaning; these persons are to us purely individual, all trace of the inclusive category has disap-

peared: they are, in the full sense of the word, our neighbors, being so near that when we look upon them we see nothing else, not even ourselves.

It is the aim of all true religions to bring men to abandon the categoric way of dealing with the fellow-man, and to take in its stead the individual method. The dictates of science approve of this change for the reason that the method of considering objects by groups, while appropriate, indeed indispensable, as regards all things beyond the reach of the effective sympathies, is unfit in the field of the affections. I cannot deal with my child, my friend, or even with my dog in the categoric manner, for the reason that the sympathies pertain to individuals and not to groups. When they seem to relate to categories we find on inspection that such is not really the case. A man who thinks that he sympathizes with the Indians, the Negroes, or other unjustly treated people, is, if he is really in a state of sympathetic movement, picturing some individual sufferer or sufferers to whom his affections go forth, or else he is mistaking for sympathy intellectual condemnation of the wrong done to the group. The task of science is the development of categories through the exercise of the reason; the task of the sympathies is to break down these categories and to deal with objects as individuals. It would be inter-

esting to follow this and other contrasts of these two groups of motives further, but it would be foreign to my purpose to do so.

Summing up these considerations concerning human contact, it may be said that the world works by a system of individualities rising in scale as we advance from the inorganic through the organic series until we find the summit in man. The condition of all these individuals is that of isolation; each is necessarily parted from all the others in the realm, each receiving influences, and, in turn, sending forth its peculiar tide of influences to those of its own and other kinds. This isolation in the case of man is singularly great for the reason that he is the only creature we know in the realm who is so far endowed with consciousness that he can appreciate his position and know the measure of his solitude. In the case of all individuals the discernible is only a small part of what exists. In man the measure of this presentation is, even to himself, very small, and that which he can readily make evident to his neighbor is an exceedingly limited part of the real whole. Yet it is on this slender basis that we must rest our relations with the fellow-man if we are to found them upon knowledge. The imperfection of this method of ascertaining the fellow-man is well shown by the

trifling contents of the categoric discriminations we apply to him. While, as has been suggested, much can be done by those who have gained in knowledge of our kind by importing understandings into our relations with men, the only effective way to the betterment of those relations is through the sympathies.

What can be done by knowledge in helping us to a comprehension of the fellow-man is at best merely explanatory of his place in the phenomenal world, of itself it has only scientific value. The advantage of the sympathetic way of approach is that in this method the neighbor is accounted for on the supposition that he is ourself in another form, so we feel for and with him on the instinctive hypothesis that he is essentially ourself. There can be no question that this method of looking upon other individualities is likely to lead to many errors. We see examples of these blunders in all the many grades of the personifying process, from the savage's worship of a tree or stone to the civilized man's conception of a human-like god. We see them also in the attribution to the lower animals of thoughts and feelings which are necessarily limited to our own kind, but in the case of man the conception of identity gives a minimum of error and a maximum of truth. It, indeed, gives a truer result than could possibly be

attained by any scientific inquiries that we could make, or could conceive of being effectively made, and this for the following reasons.

When, as in the sympathetic state, we feel that the neighbor of our species is essentially ourself, the tacit assumption is that his needs and feelings are as like our own as our own states of mind at diverse times are like one another; so that we might exchange motives with him without experiencing any great sense of strangeness. What we have in mind is not the measure of instruction or education, not the class or station or other adventitious circumstances, but the essential traits of his being. Now this supposition is entirely valid. All we know of mankind justifies the statement that, as regards all the qualities and motives with which the primal sympathies deal, men are remarkably alike. Their loves, hates, fears, and sorrows are alike in their essentials; so that the postulate of sympathy that the other man is essentially like one's self is no idle fancy but an established truth. It not only embodies the judgment of all men in thought and action but has its warrant from all the science we can apply to it.

It is easy to see how by means of sympathy we can at once pass the gulf which separates man from man. All the devices of the ages in the way of

dumb or spoken language fail to win across the void, and leave the two beings apart; but with a step the sympathetic spirit passes the gulf. In this strange feature we have the completion of the series of differences between the inorganic and the organic groups of individualities. In the lower or non-living isolations there is no reason why the units should do more than mechanically interact. All their service in the realm can be best effected by their remaining forever completely apart. But when we come to the organic series the units begin to have need of understanding their neighbors, in order that they may form those beginnings of the moral order which we find developing among the members even of the lowliest species. Out of this sympathetic accord arises the community, which we see in its simple beginnings in the earlier stages of life; it grows with the advance in the scale of being, and has its supreme success in man. Human society, the largest of all organic associations, requires that its units be knit together in certain common purposes and understandings, and the union can only be made effective by the ways of sympathy,—by the instinctive conviction of essential kinship.

Thus, while the work of building a commonwealth can be greatly helped by knowledge, it cannot be begun or continued except by that sympathetic under-

standing which alone knits men together. Knowledge may and should help by showing that the social sense of kinship is necessary to this establishment, but it cannot quicken the motive; that is done by the common spirit of the race which is included in its language, its traditions, and its religion. In so far as they do their appointed task they convey to each soul the tide of life; of the higher life of the race, which has its springs in the devotion and self-sacrifice of all its noble people. It is on this we have mainly to depend for the betterment of the contacts of men.

What we may term the contact rate of different tribes and races of men varies considerably, and with certain peoples has changed much in recent centuries. In the British Isles we find the Yorkshireman of the lower classes sullen, and disposed to an ugly state of mind towards all strangers. This humor betters among the more southern English, so that the preliminary greetings show a confidence in the unknown neighbor. The Irishman has a very quick sense of the fellow-man, while his race kinsman, the Highlander of Scotland, is more stubborn in his instinctive doubts. In general, a large admixture of Scandinavian blood, as in Western England and Southern Scotland, appears to make contacts more difficult. On the continent of Europe the more southern peoples evidently have a quicker sense of

the fellow-man than the northern. It takes about half the time to gain a preliminary understanding with a Frenchman or an Italian that it does with an Englishman. In Germany the peoples of the south are far more approachable than those of the north.

The differences in the manner of contact among various peoples appear to have little value as indices of their attitude towards the neighbor. These variations are, probably to a considerable extent, dependent on the curious medley of motives that we include under the term fashion. Thus the rigidity of the Prussian seems to be the result of the military motive and manner of the upper classes which has been imitated by the lower ranks of the people; while the half-surly way of the German Swiss may be the product of the reaction against aristocratic conditions. Yet there doubtless is in these variations of behavior towards the neighbor something of the habitual attitude of the man towards himself. The independent self-centred state of mind of the Scandinavian, where the fellow has a certain pride in his isolated self-sufficiency, causes him to answer a neighbor's hail gruffly; while the Frenchman, who evidently feels the need of his kind more keenly, speaks him fairly. The Jews, for all their bitter experiences in contact with other than their own people, have retained what appears to be

an ancient racial or tribal capacity for quick responsive contact with their fellow-men. I have, in a previous chapter, noted this feature in some detail. So far however, from the kindness of the first greeting indicating the measure of the sympathetic motive, among Europeans at least, the deeper sense of the fellowship of man appears to be the greater the less its first manifestations. It is evident from history that the Germanic stocks are less innately cruel than the Latin races, or perhaps they have more effectively subjected the ancient cruelty motive.

The lessening of the motives which led to cruelty in recent centuries among the Germanic peoples is one of the most curious features in the moral history of mankind. It is evident that in England the butcherly humor of antiquity continued in the hearts of the folk down to the thirteenth century, as is shown by the massacres of the Jews in London, Norwich, York, and other towns; but from that time forth the sympathies have been more masterful, and in the course of five hundred years have made such actions impossible. In Germany the progress, although slower, has been steadily in the same direction, so that in both these kindred peoples the moral status in this regard is at present about the same. Among the Germanic races in America the advance in the humanizing process has been even more rapid

than in the related stocks of the Old World. This, as it seems to me, began to be shown in the conduct of the native troops in the Revolutionary War; and it was admirably manifested in the Civil War, when with very rare and limited exceptions, there was no sign of the cruel motive.

Among the Latin races, or at least among the French and Spaniards, the primitive blood-thirsty motive which was universal in Europe until the end of the Middle Ages has, for some inexplicable reason, been retained to, or near to, the present time. The Frenchman, in his quiet state a very gentle fellow, becomes, when imbued with the war motive, in large measure de-humanized; the impulse to massacre holds in him much as it did in the Middle Ages, as was shown in the outbreaks of the Commune, only a third of a century ago. A part of this curious phenomenon is that the horror and shame of it appear to make no significant impression on the minds of the better people. They deprecate cruelty, but, so far as I see in their histories, regard the exhibitions of it in periods of excitement as something entirely normal. In fact we have here, as elsewhere in the French nature, most curious instances of retarded development in a people who are in certain other ways exceptionally advanced. Among the Spanish the primitive cruelty of man is retained, much as

among the French, although it does not manifest itself in wild mob furies, but in a more systematic way, as in the treatment of prisoners, or of non-combatants in civil war. In Italy the advance in the humanizing process appears to have been almost as effective as among the Germanic folk, the butcherly humor having steadfastly diminished since the time of the Renaissance.

These over-brief statements of an important general truth serve to indicate that the cruelty we note in the French and Spaniards is not peculiarly developed in them, but that it is a survival from a time when the sympathy with the fellow-man was much less keen than it is among the more advanced Germanic stocks at the present time. As for the reasons for either the advance or retardation in this regard we have nothing that is certain in the way of explanation.

The blood-thirstiness of primitive men and the general development of cannibalism among them shows plainly that man came early by his more brutal qualities. How he came by them is a perplexing question, for, so far as we can see, none of his collaterals have a trace of the motive. The gorilla is doubtless a fierce brute when at bay, but there is no evidence of the desire to harm for the gratification of other than momentary rage, and the like is true

of all the *Quadrumana*. In fact, save in a few carnivorous animals, such as the dog and wolf, none of the mammals show a blood-thirsty disposition. The dog and wolf will slay for the mere pleasure of the activity. As man comes from a group mainly feeding on fruits, nuts, and insects, and is for his size singularly unfit for combat, he should not, and probably did not, inherit from his prehuman ancestors any love of killing his neighbors; he must have developed that motive in his human estate.

That man on entering the human stage promptly developed a disposition to assail his neighbors who differed from his own tribe, is made plain by the fact that all the varieties of men on all the continents are lethal. Though the measure of their hunger for the life of those whom they regard as enemies may differ, it is always great. In fact, this desire to slay for the sake of slaying is, as above noted, almost a peculiarity of man; and the impulse to torment the enemy is the most original and unique of all the characteristics of the genus. All the other qualities of his mind have some likeness in the lower life, but this is his alone. We wrong the beasts when we speak of the slaughter during outbreaks such as the "Terror" as brutal; that is supremely human.

That this tendency to cruelty is a deep founded element in human nature may be most easily proved

by asking the reader to examine himself. It is certain that he will find evidence of it in the deep lying animal-nature desires of his own heart. He will find there subjugated, yet alive, the motives that lead to slaying for hatred's sake, and tormenting for the sake of torment. We see it in children of the gentlest breeding, however well-guarded by higher training; it is the motive in war. So far as I know there has been no extended study of the conditions which lead to the cruel motive of man. It has been accepted as a part of the human store and without much comment. The fact that it is essentially human seems to have escaped observation. I shall therefore set forth what seems to be a possible explanation of the matter.

Although I am less inclined than the most of my brother naturalists to adduce the theory of natural selection in order to account for the existence of complicated organic conditions, especially for the peculiarities of man, I am disposed to believe that it may in a measure explain the widespread development of the assailing motive in mankind for the following reasons. It is evident that primitive men were divided into small tribes, as are their nearer collateral kinsmen, the anthropoid monkeys. That tribal motive is common among all the Quadrumana; it is, indeed, almost mammalian in its gen-

erality. It is also evident that there is a certain natural hostility among the herds, droves, or other tribal divisions of the brutes; this rarely leads to death, but merely to serious bodily injury, for generally they are not provided with the means of slaying. When, however, the stage of man was attained, the wits of the creature quickly made him master of the lethal arts. The primitive spear, even when it was no more than a pointed stick, was a more effective instrument of assault when guided by human intelligence than any natural weapons such as teeth and claws afford. With each advance in arms and in the motives that gave them efficiency the primitive tribes which made those gains attained dominance over their less inventive and less militant neighbors. This condition has evidently persisted from a very early stage in human development to the present day, with the result that the originally rather inoffensive creature has become through selection a singularly brutal animal.

CHAPTER X

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF VARIETY AND SPECIES IN ORGANIC LIFE

To understand the true nature of those variations among men which are found in the physical and mental differences exhibited by the tribes, races, and species of our genus, it is necessary to take a somewhat wider view of the process of diversification of peoples than we have as yet essayed. We need not only to note that in this process of variation mankind is proceeding on a way which all organic life necessarily pursues, but also to see, in part at least, the nature of the process and its moral significance in our own exceptional genus.

Organic individuals, as before noted, differ from the inorganic in that they are able to gain by experience and to transmit their acquisitions in a cumulative way to their successors, while inorganic individuals, even if they have the vast complexity of structure and function of the celestial spheres, have not that capacity of acquiring and transmitting profit won from their surroundings. This is, indeed, the

essential difference between the living and the dead: they both have the uniform changeless life of the lower realm, but to the living shape is added the capacity for endless education, for ceaseless change in reference to environment. Just how this profit of experience is handed on through a series of organic individuals is still a matter in debate. The Darwinian school has fairly proved that it is in some measure transmitted accumulatively from generation to generation by selective processes, but only the rasher followers of the great pathfinder hold that this is the sole way by which the advance is attained. The master held to no such narrow view. It is probable that in this as in most other organic actions, we might say inorganic as well, the result is brought about through the combination of a vast complex of influences of which the survival of the fittest is but one, — certainly the most recognizable, in many fields of life the most dominant, — yet but one among many.

It is impossible in this writing to review the various hypotheses concerning the conditions of organic development. For my purpose it may be admitted that in the realms of life below the level where intelligence begins to play its part, the process of natural selection or the survival of the fittest is the dominant influence in determining the course of

advance, or, it may be, the retrogression of a series of organisms; it being understood that the primal capacities of the original form set certain limits and give a certain measure of direction to the changes which are induced. It is when the intelligence attains a stage where the individuals of a group have to act together in order to live that we begin to find serious trouble in accounting for their development by any such mechanical actions as selection implies. This feature of a common mind or intent in a group of animals has a wide range of manifestation. It may be relatively simple, as in the quickly developed sympathetic fear that moves a herd to flight; but even in such lowly forms as the insects it attains a high order of complexity. The facts of associative action are indeed more clearly indicated by structure and habits in that group than in any other organic series.

In order to set forth some of the features of the common mind which may be developed in an intellectual community, I shall note something of the exhibition of it found in any group of social insects. For this purpose I select, almost at random, a species of moth which lays its eggs on the wild cherry and a few other kindred Rosaceous plants, in order that its offspring in the grub state may feed on the young leaves until ready to enter on

the chrysalis state. In this species (*Clisiocampa americana*, Harris) the female lays its eggs in the warm season, selecting the appropriate tree in unerring manner. These eggs are placed near the top of the branches, and the nests, formed either by the same female or by a number of females, are distributed over the branches, so that the colonies hatched from them have an even chance of procuring food. Rarely, if ever, are the nests so numerous that there is not food enough to supply all the colonies which they found. In some years of rather close observation of this species, — during which time I have examined perhaps five hundred trees in determining the point, — I have not found a clear instance in which the young on any tree have failed to find adequate sustenance from its leaves and been forced to wander in search of food. It seems fairly certain that the females exercise a certain restraint in order to avoid crowding their offspring beyond the point where they may have a chance to attain their full development.

When the young caterpillars of a nest are hatched and begin to feed, they quickly associate in building a nest of spun webs, each grub taking some part in the work. At first this nest is no more than a tangle of threads put together without apparent order; yet the place in which it is installed is com-

monly well chosen, not only for the immediate needs of the hundred or so tiny creatures, but also to admit of the enlargement and change in the design of the structure to accommodate the larvæ which, before they are mature, are to be at least fifty times the size they had attained when the nest was begun. At least ninety-five per cent of these constructions are placed at a point where twigs about a fourth of an inch in diameter and to the number of three or more branch in several axes ; the result is that in the final state the housing has an even three-dimensional space, sufficient to accommodate all members of the temporary society.

Beginning when they are still not more than a fifth of an inch in length with such a slight structure as their web-producing capacity enables them to spin, the larvæ when they have grown to about twice that size proceed to alter the plan of the edifice. Apparently they feel that they are unduly crowded as they cling in the night or in bad weather to the scattered threads of their webs, and so are induced to change the form of the shelter. This they do by building a sheet of the material so tied to the branches that it is as taut as a drum, with each surface near to a plane, and so dense and with such an inclination that it will shed the rain. One or more conveniently placed openings of suitable width

afford access to this enclosed space, while a series of floors give the creatures a chance to lie at ease within the cover. As the larvæ still further increase in bulk, other envelopes are built from time to time outside of the original sheeting, so that if the colony is successful there may be four or more of these, each separated from the other by a space that just admits of the storage of the creatures and of their ready passage to the branches where they feed. It is to be noted also that from the nest to the feeding places there is commonly a web-covered path composed of a few strands of the fibre, which serves to guide the larvæ on their journeys to and fro, as well as to smooth the way. This web appears to be spun by the first that traverse the path. In those seldom cases in which the nest of this moth is so ill placed that it cannot be extended, it is usually abandoned by the young grubs and another site chosen that better fits their needs. It is probable that the emigrants may in some instances find refuge with another colony where there chances to be room. That such is the case is shown by the occasional presence of nearly mature individuals in a nest together with a set of larvæ so small that they could not have come from the same group of eggs. In these migrations all the members of a colony are apparently not guided by a like impulse,

as is shown by the fact that now and then a nest will be found which contains only two or three mature larvæ, while the shed skins show that it originally held a hundred or more now being lodged with other near-by groups to which they have betaken themselves.

Those who know something of the history of the lepidopterous insects will recognize the fact that such phenomena of associative action between individuals are repeated, as described above, with many variations in a host of species of the order. Spontaneously, with no chance of obtaining any instruction from the elders of their kind, these creatures so react on one another that a common mental, or, as we may term it, colonial, purpose is attained which results in very complicated joint products in the highest measure purposeful. This common mind is in certain respects as well ordered as that of an individual, for those associatively built webs are as artfully contrived, and as well adapted to the needs of the creatures, as is the one built by a single spider working quite alone. The same feature of association is shown in other orders of insects; in the Hymenoptera, among the bees, and in the order to which the Termites belong. I shall do no more than note the fact that these several widely separated groups show how the intellectual community is formed

wherever among the insects the needs of association lead thereto. It is evident that in the intelligence of the articulated animals there is a latent capacity for combining the work of a host of individuals, so that from the association is developed something of the nature of public opinion, — we lack a better term for it, — which enables and requires all the coöperators to act in unison.

It is the usual practice to dismiss the intellectual work of insects with the question-begging term “instinct;” to assume that they act in some automatic manner that does not involve intelligence. I cannot agree with this for many reasons, of which one must here suffice. Granting that the mode of operation of instinct differs from that of a conscious mind, it still has to be assumed that such deeds as I have described are in their essence mental, for they take account of conditions beyond the body and adjust the doing to varied necessities. It is not only to be granted that the quality of this mind is specifically and generically different from our own, but it has to be admitted that it is of another type from that which we possess. What we know of instinctive actions in our own selves goes to prove that psychologists have erred in supposing that mind is of one general nature. The facts taken at large in the organic realm clearly indicate that if we could visualize the

diverse kinds of intelligence we should perceive them to be quite as varied as the bodies in which they are lodged. The assumption, generally tacit, that mind is of one relatively invariable quality arises from the fact that our means of observing its character are exceedingly limited ; the advantage we have in watching it in insects is that because of their small size, their high degree of activity, and the capacity for mechanical constructions afforded by their peculiar frames, we have a better chance than elsewhere in the lower animals to measure and to determine the character of certain of their mental qualities. There is reason for believing that the same capacity which we find in the insects for developing interactive instincts, that is to say, spontaneous, unconscious modes of intellectual action between individuals of the same species, exists in the vertebrate type up to and including man.

The best evidence that the higher vertebrates near the series leading to man have capacity for instinctive coöperation—such as leads to the development of a common mind guiding a social order—is found in the rodents. The social organization of communities in this group often attains the same kind of perfection, though their work does not show the eminent shapeliness that we find in the webs, honeycombs, and hills of the insects. In the beaver

lodge the individuals are associated in an accord that makes their work even more effective than that of primitive men. By a consensus of the laborers, evidently without leadership or instruction, they do complicated work which is adjusted to very variable conditions and effected in a varied manner. Thus, though very rarely, they will, at times and places when it is necessary for their purpose, dig canals on which to float their timber if it is too far to drag it over-land. Again they will abandon the habit of dam-building and for generations betake themselves for lodgment to holes in the river banks, and resume their old habit of construction when the circumstances favor such action. Thus the beavers of eastern Virginia gave up long ago the habit of building dams, because of the hunter; but in the Civil War, when their persecutors were otherwise engaged, they returned to that ancestral plan of life and once again built dams.

The various genera and species of small rodents commonly known as field mice have constructive habits almost as remarkable as those of the beaver, — habits which exhibit the same insect-like instinct combined with a share of vertebrate intelligence. More than in the insects, the communal rodents adapt their instinctive actions to varying conditions; yet the difference is one of degree, for even the larvæ

of the moths, as elsewhere described, vary their actions not a little to meet the needs that arise in the course of their lives. It should be noted that while these insects are in the grub state, there is certainly no clear vision; at most, they discern only the differences in light. They can take no account of their webs by sight, their information must come by touch alone; and yet they manage to bring about results which are quite like those attained by the *Mammalia* with image-making eyes, each individual associating its action with that of its fellows of the community in a very perfect way.

Although there is no basis for accurate computation it may safely be estimated that there are now in existence somewhere near a hundred thousand species of animals, mostly insects, all of which, substantially without means of denoting their own intentions or appreciating those of another of their kind, are able to associate their action in such a way that the community has a common mind. Wherever a communal need arises we see that this mental communism at once appears. In a word, the facts indicate that it is characteristic of a species, at least in the animal kingdom, that its members are capable of developing a peculiar mental understanding, a consensus of thought and action, which is not possible among members of diverse species. That we

do not perceive the existence of this quality in the greater number of genera and classes is due to the fact that their habits do not call for its development. It is unnoticeable in the greater number of insect groups; yet here and there, among very diverse orders, coming into view suddenly wherever the habits are such as to call for its exercise, the ability to work together appears, giving us the perfection of the ant-hill, the honeycomb, the webs of the social larvæ, or the constructions of the beavers.

From the facts above noted we may fairly deduce the conclusion that in the species of men we are likely to find something of the special mental quality, the peculiar specific motive of the mind leading to associative action found in the lower life. In other words, it is to be expected that the mental differences in the several species of our genus will be at least as great as the physical; and that there will be signs of a consensus or material understanding among the members of each group which cannot easily be attained by individuals of different groups. That this condition exists in relation to the species and varieties of mankind is amply proved,—it is indeed the very substance of human history.

I turn now to consider the process by which an organic species or variety is established. Putting

aside the debatable questions as to the influences which make for such variations, there are many facts which all naturalists accept as certain. First, every existing species or variety has come into existence by changes in some way brought about in an antecedent group whence its form has been derived. The passage from the antecedent to the consequent group is accompanied in practically all instances by some change of shape or habits fitting the creatures to conditions to which they were not before adapted. The alteration is not only in bodily form, it is in mental as well, for there is some modification of motives associated with every bodily change. In no instance as yet has the process of establishing a new species been observed in the field of nature, but we may obtain what seem to be fair semblances of the course of events in our experiments with domesticated animals and plants. Assuming that the likeness is true, as in all probability is the case, we may proceed to state the process of variation as far as it is visible.

When by selection or other means the descendants of a preceding species,—for instance, those derived from the wild stock of our barnyard fowl (*Gallus bankivus*) or the common parent of our domesticated pigeons (*Columba livia*),—are made to vary much in shape from the original form, their

habits also undergo some change. Thus with our common fowls, ducks, and geese we find that they become instinctively bound up with man. However neglected, they rarely if ever run wild, clinging obstinately to human habitations. So too with the domesticated pigeons; though they will become in a way rangers, they cleave to peopled places, never becoming, so far as I have been able to find, really wild. They may in appearance return very nearly to the shape and color of the original stock, yet the peculiarities of their mental quality remain strong enough to justify for them the name of a distinct species. The like is the case with certain other of our domesticated animals. So far as I have been able to learn, the sheep, the dog, and probably the goat, do not feralize, though all of them are quite able to maintain themselves in a wild state. It is otherwise with horses, pigs and cattle. They all, though rather unwillingly, will adopt a life independent of man. Thus about half of the species which we have in common domestication show clearly that a very considerable change has been brought about in their mental quality, for the motives which make them cleave to man are certainly important innovations in their original characteristics. To my mind, these groups are in their mental features more specifically distant from their

wild progenitors than they are in their physical shape. So far as these relatively brief experiments of man go to show the process of forming varieties and species they indicate that the variations of the mind are in general more easily instituted and are more permanent than those of the body. If any one doubts this proposition let him study the dog, in which the intelligence has been in a way revolutionized by a few thousand years of contact with mankind. It matters not whether the creature be derived from a wild species of the genus *Canis* or whether his blood is a mingling of several species, it is plain that great as have been the physical alterations wrought by selection they are surpassed by the mental changes which have been induced in the stock.

There is evidence going to show that in the varieties induced by artificial selection the peculiar forms have a tendency, not always marked, to keep separate from one another, at least when the conditions favor their isolation. Thus if a number of very different breeds of sheep are allowed to roam in extensive pastures, the several stocks will commonly herd apart from each other. The evidence, though not very clear, leads me to the belief that a distinct diversity of aspect in practically all cases leads diverse breeds of our domesticated animals to group them-

selves separately. The motive is not so strong that it will cause a single exceptional individual to keep away from the others, but where there are a number of each kind, males and females, they will tend to herd apart. This feature is most apparent in sheep, and least so in horses. While this segregating motive is apparently not strong enough to prevent interbreeding, it obviously tends to effect this end, for the males of separate herds are likely to resist the approaches of the males of other herds. In other words, it seems to me that we observe in our domesticated breeds of animals, though somewhat indistinctly, the beginnings of that process of mental isolation which is necessary to convert an inconstant variety into the more firmly established species.

It is evident that as a new species is established it normally becomes a competitor against others of nearly related habits which occupy the same field. It claims a share of the food and the other opportunities the field affords. Its success in the struggle depends upon the vigor with which it contends with its rivals for the chances of life, on the measure in which it presses upon the competing forms. In the vegetable kingdom and the lower series of the animals, this assault on the rival appears as a mere blind insistence; but as the scale of intelligence rises a distinct hatred between the contestants is apt to

develop, such as exists between the species of predaceous animals when they are brought into contact. It is with the individualized species as with the personal individual, each is the centre of actions and has to maintain itself in strife with its neighbors. Hence the inevitable organic war that exists between all competing individuals and the societies they form — a war which is one of the marks of the life that rises above the lower inorganic plane, and continues unceasingly until the moral life begins to develop in the love of kindred and to widen in the sympathies of enlarged men. For our purpose, therefore, a species may be defined as an aggregate of kindred creatures in which the sympathies bind the individuals together so as to form a common mind, but with the sympathies limited to the fellows of the kind, all beyond the bound being disregarded, or, if regarded at all, considered as enemies and the subject of active hatred. There is an exception to this rule in the domesticated animals which, by a newly developed or converted instinct, came to look upon man as a master, and to depend on his presence for a kind of moral support. There are other slight exceptions where species appear to come into some measure of sympathetic relations with others of very different nature ; yet these do no more than accent the grim truth that, in proportion as varieties or

species are developed, and as a condition of their development, enmity with their competing neighbors necessarily arises. The process is indeed a part of that great work of individualizing life which has led to the personal independence and efficiency of man and to the isolation of his communities. The bearing of all this on the race problem which mankind is now facing is evident. It will be further considered in the closing chapter.

In considering the development of what may be termed the specific motive in animals, it is well to note the fact that it depends mainly on the sympathies and in very small measure on the rational part of the mind. The individuals of each group are moved by tokens which excite at once and strongly in all its members, fear, rage, or other impulses, so that they act in common. There is something very curious and instructive in these contagions of excitement which we behold in our flocks and herds. They seem ever to be penetrated by the mob spirit which appears from time to time in man, and compelled to act together. In fact, this crowd motive, so far from being peculiar to man, is in him a mere remainder of the impulse which profitably guided the lower species through which his life came to its higher estate. In those lower forms where the spiritual individualization could not, for lack of intelligence, go far, it was

advantageous to have all the members of a community act together on the lines of certain simple, blind impulses; for thereby the society attained a certain rude strength, as men do in war. It is on these massive and gross sympathies that the intellectual isolation of species comes in time to be founded. It is, indeed, not unlikely that on their origination depends in some measure the beginning of specific variation, and that among the higher animals a species is not often firmly established until these motives are so organized as to lead its members to act in a coöperative manner against all competitors.

For the reason that the evident physical differences between species blind us to the unseen mental variations, the observer needs carefully to attend to all the facts which fairly lead him to infer the intellectual differences between such groups. Those facts seem to me amply to justify the conclusion that among the higher animals at least the specific individualizing of motives immediately accompanies the physical diversification of the new group, if it does not in general precede it, and that the mental isolation of the group serves to preserve it from being absorbed by interbreeding with the parent stock or other related varieties. Still further, I find warrant for the supposition that the minds of animals are more readily variable than their bodies, and that by

these variations the creatures are impelled in some undetermined measure to new habits of life, which in diverse ways, under the control of natural selection, bring about changes in form and structure. This view is in effect a mingling of the Lamarckian and the Darwinian hypotheses, two diverse views of the same subject, each of which has in my opinion much help to give us in interpreting organic changes.

The likeness of the specific, common mind to that which we may term a tribal or national state of mind is evident. The meaning of the resemblance is to be found in the fact that a tribe or nation is normally a variety of a particular species of men, or of those who are in conditions that lead to the formation of a new species. When these have attained to a certain isolation and have developed an independent group of motives and mutual understandings they are on the way to become a separate species. In olden times, when tribes or states were small and the inter-migration non-existing or limited, the process of differentiation went on swiftly, so that in a few generations the variety was in some measure established. Under modern conditions, when nations are usually great complexes composed of many different stocks, the development is not so rapid nor is the tribal motive of the same nature. In place of such intense and narrow autonomic spirit as existed in

the little states of Greece, we have the broader spirit of nationality, yet in its essence the condition of mind is the same. It is that of sympathy with those who are conceived to be of the community, even if unseen and unknown, and a corresponding dislike or even blind hatred for those who are of another group. In a word, the tribal, or in its enlarged form the national, motive is but the human shape of the ancient communal impulse that served to keep related species apart. Not only does this view serve to widen our understanding of organic processes, it may also serve to account for much in the conduct of human aggregates that would otherwise be inexplicable.

It needs but a glance at the doings of man to show us that while the individual of our genus appears to be, and in many respects is, a very isolated being, he is after all strangely controlled by a vast and mighty though invisible influence,—the common mind of his tribe, state, or class. This is best shown when men, as in times of war or other excitement, become possessed of what we call the mob spirit, a condition in which for a time they are impelled by an instinctive sympathy, such as sways the brutes, impelling all the members of the group who are near enough to be contagiously affected to like rage or fear. In the ordinary routine of a human society

the diversities of individual action conceal from us the abiding influence of the common mind; yet the inquirer finds that it is there, influencing the course of action of every person, continually changing from generation to generation, and swaying the body of folk with a strange might. Those who have not attained a sense of the power of this great unseen have failed to gain that without which it is impossible to comprehend the meaning of society. Those who fail to see that this controlling motive of our states is but the enlargement of the common mind of the organic tribe as we find it in the stages of life below our kind, are not in a position to comprehend one of the most important conditions of human life.

This quality of life which leads to the union of kindred individuals by the bonds of sympathy is much talked about but little comprehended. We commonly take sympathy to be an occasional outgoing of the mind to the neighbor; to be a rather seldom movement of the spirit, or a kind of exercise of virtue. The truth is, that sympathy is a primal organic necessity which began to exist many thousand species back in the series of man and has grown mightily in his estate. Along with it as a correlative has grown hatred, in itself a kind of reversed sympathy, each having its appropriate function in the lower life; sympathy to unite the kind, hatred to keep

it whole in the struggle for existence. In the state of man as it is to be, sympathy is to expand, and to expel hatred; even now the two motives are in conflict with one another, with the higher steadfastly winning in the contest. We are at a point where the sympathy is indispensable and the hatred dispensable. Every man has to shape his thoughts with reference to other men seen or unseen. He can hardly think except in terms that recognize the fellow-man. What was in the lower life an occasional and limited quickening of the motive is with him incessant. Hence arises that higher common mind of our species which is but an enlargement of what every variety of intellectual beings develops.

Seen as we may now behold it, the common bond of mankind is in effect an instinctive desire of each individual to identify himself with what he conceives to be his community. To accomplish this end he swiftly and unconsciously catches the tokens which show the motives of his fellows. In this task he exhibits a skill which is primitive: the same skill we find in the tent-making grubs or in the constructive rodents. It has taken ages of training to endow life with this singular capacity for a swift contagious understanding of the neighbor, and the successes are perhaps the most marvellous of organic accomplishments.

Those who would shape men to their betterment need to take more account of the natural history of motives than they have done in the past. They need to see that they are not dealing with the immediate will of man but with a body of instincts which has been established by the ages, and can only be opposed by motives of a high and controlling order. Against these gross, unceasing, brutal sympathies they must match other sympathetic motives of a nobler sort. Fortunately in that great moral complex there is a vast range of efficient dominant impulses which can be turned to good account. Sympathy is indeed not one thing, it is a host of diverse impulses, some of which, as those that breed the mob, are of a very ancient and lowly order; others, such as the impulses to self-sacrifice, are almost infinitely above the brutal plane. Fortunately the motive of race hatred, once necessary for the safety of species, is to become, in the moral order towards which man is approaching, like the survival of a bodily part the use of which has ceased. Even now among civilized people, those who have risen beyond tribal needs, this motive may well be compared to the appendix of the cæcum, a remnant of a primitive estate which is altogether evil, for it breeds disease.

CHAPTER XI

THE WAY OUT

THE aim of what has been set forth in the preceding chapters has been to array certain tolerably evident facts concerning the conditions of development and of contact of the diverse tribes and races of men with a view to providing foundation for some considerations as to the way in which various grievous evils of human intercourse may be remedied. The phenomena adverted to are, from a scientific point of view, very interesting, for they serve, along with much else here unnoted, to show that man is a part of the whole life of the planet; that into his field of action enter motives which were developed in the ages when in the lower life his form and spirit were prepared for their tasks. Their principal value, however, is to be found in their moral significance, in the guidance they afford in our conduct in relation to the neighbor, in the bettered definition which they enable us to make of our fellows to the end that we may escape from the ancient evils of hatred. In order to make use of these con-

siderations which have been set forth, — necessarily in a somewhat diffused manner, — I shall now sum them up in a brief statement, setting before the reader what seems to be the position of man in relation to his organic inheritances, and what is his duty by his kind.

We may assume as certain that man inherits all the primal motives of his nature, along with all of his bodily parts, from the vast numbers of species through which his life has passed in the upward march which began with the lowliest organic form. We may furthermore assume that the likeness of his inherited mental parts to those of his brutal kindred is nearly as close as is his bodily frame to theirs. Knowing as we do that every component part of that frame, — bones, muscles, and organs, — was shaped in the lower life, to vary only in form and proportion in the higher, we may fairly suppose that the mental powers have been passed on in a similar way. We may grant that these have been developed amazingly, so that it is here and there difficult to recognize that they have sprung from the ancient seed. Yet the facts tell that while here and there man has gone far in aggrandizing his inherited parts and qualities, many of them stay almost unchanged. His gain has been mainly in his rational power, and to a limited degree in the emo-

tional field; for except where emotions have been qualified by reason, he is little changed. The primitive loves, hates, and greeds are in the body of mankind so little altered from their lower estate that we see at a glance that they are not to be reckoned as human but, more broadly, as animal. We see further that the first task of man in the management of himself within the moral order, is to scan those survivals of his pre-moral state and to bring them into the control of his truly human powers.

To begin with the inheritances of the instinctive order, we see that in man we have, first, the ancient organic motives which relate to the preservation of his individual life, — hunger for food, fear of the enemy, hatred of the rival; and along with them, sexual greed, and the sense of property in the male. The former, the most fundamental of organic motives, are all selfish; they relate only to the satisfaction of the individual; there is no sympathetic quality in them. With the characteristic feature of organic life, reproduction, the sympathetic series begins. The reason why this group of motives should have its origin in the relation of the generations is easily seen. The young of nearly all animal species are born in a feeble state and need the care of a parent, or of both parents, in order to bring them to such maturity that they may care for themselves.

In the lower forms this parental help is given by provisions and contrivances of a mechanical sort, though the actions of the parents probably are guided by emotions that relate to the unborn. With the advance to the plane of the Mammalia the care of the mother becomes more immediate, for the reason that she suckles her offspring. As has been well set forth by several discerning students of life, this relation is peculiarly well suited to develop those higher sympathies which begin in the mother's love. As we advance in the grade of the Mammalia who are near our ancestral line, and especially in the higher forms of the series, the Quadrumana, we see that the male comes to share in some varying degree in the affection of the mother for the young. More commonly the sense of solicitude in the male relates to the larger aspect of the family, — that of the drove or the herd; it is not until we attain to man that there is the discernment which makes recognition of paternity possible, that sense being peculiarly human, developed, most likely, at a rather late stage in the evolution of the genus.

It is altogether probable that the first sense of true sympathy in the Mammalia begins in the maternal relation. In the birds, however, — a group remote from our own succession, for our common ancestors are probably as low down as the Amphibia, —

conjugal affection appears almost as soon as the maternal, and the mutual love of male and female, as among the pigeons and parrots, is as devoted as in man, and in some forms more ineradicable. In the pre-human Mammalia the love of the sexual mate appears in few, if in any cases, to be well determined, or to rise above the plane of hunger or the sense of possession. In none of the species of this class do we find the survivor pine away on the death of the spouse, as is the case with some species of intensely monogamous birds. In our own series below the human plane, therefore, we have the personal sympathies limited at first to the love of the female for the offspring, and the less intense, but often devoted love of the male for the herd or class, or even for its kind. This love for the community is sometimes evident in the females as well as the males. The cry of distress of a pig will arouse both sexes to sympathy, but the motive appears to be far more intense in the males. So far as I have been able to find, there is no evidence to show that any animal below man, save the dog and the elephant, shows any distinct sympathy with the creatures of other species than its own, and these exceptions are so affected by the peculiar conditions of domestication that they do not invalidate the rule. The fact before noted, that sundry other species which have been

subjected by man cling to his dwelling-places, may safely be set down to habit and not regarded as in any way due to sympathy. We thus see that nothing in the way of sympathy has been brought over from the lower life to that of man, except those affections which have grown up in the family, — the original love of mother for child, with the diffused love for all the members of the family, and, its larger shape, the tribe.

The peculiar part of man in relation to the sympathies has consisted in his work of combining and associating them with his rational endeavors. Coming to understand, as the beasts did not, the relation of the father to the child, he evolved the idea of kinship with his children and developed the love of the father for his own offspring, a form of the parental motive which is peculiarly human. This advance was not only in itself an enlargement of great significance, but it led immediately to the development of a rational basis for the tribe, and gave that institution at once a sympathetic foundation which has made it the basis of all ethnic development. The tribe in the primitive sense is a unit by virtue of the recognized blood-kinship of all its members. This extremely ancient conception, the first large social idea that man appears to have formed, has shaped history as none other of his constructions.

Coming upon the notion of blood-relationship as the basis of sympathetic relations man has amplified it with his imagination, linked it with his religion, with his statecraft, with his social ideals, so that it has ever been the very foremost element in his communal life.

The obvious tendency of modern society as distinguished from the ancient is to diminish the attention of men to blood-relation. Many things have helped in this noticeable change. At an early stage in the advance of men the conquests of the tribe made it necessary to come to some understanding with extra-tribal folk. The original, simple method of slaying the conquered gave place to the plan of enslaving them in order that their services might be profitable to the tribe. The presence of aliens, even as slaves, was, however, enlarging, for it served to extend the conception of a common humanity to extra-tribal people. Thus the first considerable betterment of the tribal motive came, as a host of others have come, through the economic spirit. Along with the custom of enslaving the conquered arose the curious habit of adopting the captive alien who had won esteem because he exhibited valor in war or endurance of torture. The fact that he was not of the conqueror's tribe was, with curious generality, met by a ceremony in which his blood

was mingled with that of some one of his captors. By this fiction, one of many relating to the blood, the rule of consanguinity as the basis of the community was maintained. In time the rite fell into disuse, but the idea of adoption still holds in the laws and customs of civilized states, in the legal process by which an alien may be made a member of the enlarged family.

If space allowed, an interesting story could be told of the conditions of the tribes of all primitive peoples known to us, going to show the singular generality of the rule that these primitive communities were shaped on the human discovery of what consanguinity signifies, and on the assumed bond of blood which it institutes among kindred even of the remotest degree. An essential feature of it all is that this early view of man concerning himself and his relations usually assumes that the folk of his tribe have a peculiar position in the world from the fact that they are in some way descended from the ruling god, while those of other tribes have no such divine right. This relation to the tribal god may be by direct generation, or it may be that it is the result of the creative will of that power. In either case, however, it appears one of the bases for the peculiar contempt and hatred for extra-tribal folk which is so characteristic of the primitive commu-

nities and so ineradicable even in most civilized men. An inspection of the facts leads to the conclusion that the abundant fictions serving to sustain the isolation of the tribe are but contrivances of man's intelligence to help out the primitive, irrational motive which developed in the lower stages of life and led each kind to limit its sympathies to those of its stock. Many like examples could be cited to show that the commonest misuse of the reason and the imagination is to devise notions to support an irrational motive which is strong enough to be mastering, yet is felt to need explanation.

With the embodiment of the tribe in the modern state a number of influences came into action which tend to break down that primitive community. The concepts of the state or nation, though they rest to a certain extent on early-developed motives, are due mainly to human desires. The concepts of the tribe, to a great extent pre-human, are in a measure taken over into the state. The exclusive motive of the lower association is often adopted, but the enlargement of the purpose in this modern form of the commonwealth tends to destroy the grossest evils of the tribal condition. Mainly by the opportunities of commerce, in the larger sense of that word, the modern commonwealth tends to subjugate the tribal impulses which continue to abide

in it. Religion has unhappily proved ineffective in this work, because in the tribal shape, to which it inevitably tends, it serves to promote exclusiveness. Such tribal divisions as subsist in modern states coincide to a great extent with differences of faith, so that the motive which more than any other should serve for union helps to keep alive the impulse towards separation. Trade has done much to help on the unification of men by bringing them in some measure together, yet from the essentially selfish nature of business, the contacts it brings about do not serve to effect a real union. The condition of the relations of the Israelites to the Christians in all countries, except, perhaps, England, clearly shows that commercial intercourse cannot alone be relied on to do more than mitigate the evil of the tribal hatred which remains a menace to commonwealths, even where trade relations have subsisted for a thousand years or more. It is indeed clear that some new and larger way of approach to the solution of this problem needs to be essayed.

The failure of our commonwealth spirit to win past the tribal motives and prejudices and the persistence of those impulses despite the fact that the main purpose of Christ was to destroy them, show that they are rooted in the substance of human nature, and, if not, indeed, ineradicable, that they

will have to be expurgated by some agency that has not yet been applied to them. Clearly, the only way open to us for a new essay is by means of the understanding,—by knowledge, which, married to the sympathies, shall give them a measure of control over our feelings not attainable in other ways. The purpose of this closing chapter is to urge upon the shaping class of our states such a union of modern learning with the Christian motive as may serve to array the whole of man's spirit against this ancient ill.

It should be noted that in the opinion of certain students of the mind the primitive emotions are not held to be influenced by knowledge. Against this opinion I have to contend. I hold that the whole history of human advancement is one long story of the qualification of the originally inherited impulses derived from the lower life in man and beast by the influence of knowledge,—knowledge brought into contact with the primal impulses through the exercise of the mastering will. In this path of advance man has gone far to subjugate the original polygamous instinct, replacing it by the monogamous motive. The cruelty which he inherited from his lower human stages has been so far sublated that it is little seen save in organized war. The greed for gain has been limited by the development of the

sense of property ; and in the field of the æsthetic, learning has vastly extended the range and scope of the inborn sense of beauty. So too in religions, the rational has at every turn, though often only in a limited way, served to modify and better the field of action. What we have gained as men in the way of enlargement has mainly been won by just such an application of knowledge to native impulse as we should now seek to bring about in the further effacement of the tribal evil. Those who would go with me in the quest for a better relation with the neighbor should take with them a clear sense of the history and station of the organic individual and of the advance of that relation in the series leading to man. The burden of these considerations is not small, but the most important part of it may be summed up in a few statements, each of vast importance.

First, each person in the organic series is necessarily a strangely solitary being, who for a brief time is the keeper of the life of its kind ; its part is, to gain what it may of profitable experience and to transmit of this what it can. This isolated state of the individual, apparently complete in the lower stages of being, is, everywhere in the advance towards man, relieved by a union of the separate persons in some form of communal life. The result

is that from the separate organic units a new unit, that of the society, is evolved, — a new kind of individual, which lives enduringly and can store in itself something of the profit won by its evanescent members. In this social organization in the stages below man, the essence of the tribal motives is fixed; upon its firm establishment the enduring qualities of varieties and species has intimately depended.

The next point is that man, attaining rationality, and so endowed with the power to criticise his actions, is forced by his reason to take account of the situation developed by his instincts and his moral and rational needs. Among the first of his duties is to inspect these ancient transmittenda to see what of the store he shall retain for its good, and what because of its evil he shall seek to cast away. This task has been that of man since he began his upward human march. The work hitherto has been done instinctively, with no recognition of its larger meaning, and without the sanctions that knowledge affords. It is now for us, with the aid of all that learning gives to help us to means and ways of betterment, to go on with the process.

Unless the reader feels the obligation to apply all the resources of knowledge to the criticism and improvement of the society which he serves, he cannot take the part in that work which belongs to a

man of his day. Some part for good or evil he must necessarily take, for his life enters into the communal life of his people to abide here while that life endures. He may dully limit that part to what it was in the species below man's estate, but in doing so he will not be a dutiful man of the present time, for he will have put aside all that knowledge has given in the way of help for his task. Supposing that we are willing to act up to the measure of our knowledge, evidently the first thing to do is to examine into our inheritances to determine which of them are evil. This is an ancient quest; from the time our ancestors began to have a glimmering of the moral law men have been engaged at it. To them the ancient brutal lusts were the instigations of the devil. They are none the less the devil to us because of our understanding that they are the remnants of the old laws of animal life that have to be broken down and cast away in order that the new moral order may rule the hosts of our kind.

It is interesting to observe how early the moralists who began the modern life of man seized upon the evils of tribal prejudices and hatreds as the very first of the evils to be cleared away in order to make room for the higher life, and how persistently the spirit of the tribe has fought against their revelations, neglecting or distorting their teachings

in order to hold to those innately dear ills. This secular battle of the ancient man against the new is seen in several religions, but nowhere so plainly as in that of Christ. It is evident that while Christ set his face against all the sins of the flesh, he above all opposed the motive of tribal pride and hatred. With a clearness of understanding which puts him immeasurably above all other leaders he saw straight to the centre of the ills that beset mankind; saw that they lay in the lack of friendliness for the neighbor of every estate. He sought the cure where we have to seek it, in the conviction that whatever be the differences between men, they are trifling compared with the identities which should unite them in universal brotherhood.

The sense of the situation of man to which Christ attained was won on a different path from that which we, as moderns, are able to take. He found the way to his conclusion as the seer finds it, through the emotions, by the power of irrational penetration, which we as naturalists have to confess a true way, even though it be not that on which the spirit of our time bids us journey. The reason why this way has not led men in general to betterment is that it has to be illuminated by a spiritual light denied to most of them. Ever since Christ taught, the capacity for seeing as he saw has been lessening,

probably because the rational, the Greek mode of interpreting nature, has been gaining over the primitive religious mode. The two methods of interpretation have for centuries been in conflict, and the contention has lessened in both of them the power they should have had for improving the moral and social state of our kind. On the basis of Christ's teachings, having love for its only motive, it was possible to organize a community; with science in its present condition it might have been practicable to have contrived a working commonwealth without Christianity. With the two antagonistic views confusing the minds of men it seems impossible, to judge from experience, to make any head against the tribal motives with the resulting race hatreds and warfare.

There seems to be but one way out of our trouble, and that is by the union of the influences of both religion and science for complete understanding of human qualities, so that all the help of both groups of motives shall enter into our daily life. It is apparently out of the question to expect this effective union to come by the adoption into religion of the body of learning that science has gathered, for it unhappily appears that religion inevitably becomes formal, and ordinarily rests upon assumptions that science cannot grant. But the organic motive of re-

ligion, at least of Christianity, that discernment of the Master as to the essential kinship of all men and of the love they owe one another, is a scientific fact that should find its place for its full value in the store of natural learning. It may be granted that there is much else in Christianity besides the doctrine of human kinship and the duty of love, but that else is not in a shape to be transferred to the storehouse of science for the reason that it cannot be tested by scientific criteria.

The reason why the concept of Christ as to the proper relation of man to man fits into the system of natural science, is that it is seen to rest on the organic history of the human group, indeed, we may say of organic life. The Master found it after the manner of the prophet, and based his insistence on it upon the ancient faith of men in their seers. Science discerns the truth in its way by observing that the sympathy or love of related beings for one another is the result of a slowly expanding growth,—a growth that has gone on in the chain of species which led the life of our kind up the long way towards the moral stage of life. Next to life itself, this love of individuals for one another is the noblest result of the evolutionary processes. As before remarked, it is the correlative of the process by which personal individuality and the resulting iso-

lation is developed; the unit is merged in the kind and made a sharer in its wider life. This process, while it has its greatest value in its moral significance, is none the less a scientific truth; for moral truths are as fitly to be reckoned by science as those which are mathematical. Clearly existing, observable, computable, they are fitly a part of natural learning.

Accepting the principle that the phenomenon of love for the neighbor as understood by Christ is to be regarded as belonging in the store of science, we thereby attain a wider meaning of the science of mankind than has commonly been given to it. With that enlarged meaning we are entitled to say from the point of view of the new learning that whoever would act rationally in his dealings with his fellows, whoever would bring into those relations the best help that knowledge can give, must first of all take with him love. If he does that he is in the way of light; if he fails so to do, he is in the way of darkness. To some people the adjuration to conform to the higher trends of organic development will not seem to have any imperative value, and this for the reason that nature is to them an undiscerned realm, they have no sense of the history of our kind, and the story when told to them is mere words. But this view as to man's responsibility to the order of

the realm is steadfastly gaining, and although we are in the beginning of the advance, there are many who feel it, and we may be sure that it is soon to be the common property of all who shape our societies.

Turning now to the use which may be made of the state of mind that comes to us from a study of the natural history of man, let us see what should be the ideals of our contact with our neighbor. First let us note that the fit conception of him is that he is as a man a kinsman. This view is but an extension of the tribal motive which gives consideration to the fellow-tribesman in the conception of kinship, but denies it to other men on the theory of their separate origin. From the point of view of science, the identities existing between the most diverse kinds of men are vastly greater than the diversities. The uniting features are essential, they include all the intellectual and moral qualities that distinguish human beings from the brutes. As such, the individual man who stands before us is, whatever his estate, our neighbor in that he is of the strangely elect of all living kinds.

So far as we can we should bring to the meeting with this kinsman a sense of the place he occupies in the realm. I am, by painful experience, aware how hard it is to win past the deeply founded com-

monplace state of mind with which we meet the neighbor. It is impossible to take into that contact much of the large understandings we may gain as to the estate of man ; yet I know by the same test that, through dwelling on this conception until it becomes an imbedded part of our thought, there is developed a change in the way of looking on the neighbor which greatly helps us in regarding him as he should be regarded. Here as elsewhere the art is to bring the state of mind bred of large thinking into the routine of life. The matter of that thought is necessarily for the closet, but the spirit of it should be made to fill and direct the stream of emotions which attend and guide our action in common deeds. There is no novelty in this prescription, it is that of the sages and saints of all time.

An important part of this method of clearing away the evils of tribal prejudice or the other influences which lessen the dignity of our intercourse with the neighbor, is to put aside all trace of suspicion of him. There is an obvious tendency for all sentient creatures to approach others of their kind with a certain fear of harm. This motive is one of the indelible marks in ancient experience of brute and brutal man. Any one who is trained in studying his own hidden motives may detect the impulse at the moment of contact with the stranger. If his ex-

perience supplies him with the means of comparison he will readily note that his state of mind is like that of the soldier in an enemy's country ; fainter but essentially the same. In the olden life it was the necessary state of the individual, for until man conceived of the moral law it was himself against the world. In our time, it is a disease-breeding remnant of what once served a purpose, a moral appendix that now profits death alone.

By putting away our own suspicion of the neighbor, we at once destroy what of that motive he has towards us. This fact has been well illustrated by my experience with men in many countries and under varied conditions, most recently by contacts with the people in the long-harassed rural districts of Central Cuba, where the unfortunate folk have become so imbued with the war spirit that the countryman rides armed like a trooper. Frequently as I approached I could see that he loosened his pistol in his holster, usually keeping his hand on the butt. It was evident, however, that I was quite unarmed, and as I paid no attention to the attitude of combat of these men, they were at first rather disconcerted ; but in a moment their excellent human nature broke through the restraints of custom and they became friendly. It needs no wide-ranging experience to show that with all sorts and condi-

tions of men, even with the professional villain, confidence in their sympathetic motive inevitably awakens a like emotion. The reaction is, indeed, as certain as that which arouses fear or hate. It may be as safely assumed as any other natural phenomenon. I have tried this method of approaching men for many years, often in situations which to the doubter would have seemed perilous; yet so far as I can discern I have been by it so well protected that I have never been near to danger. I am sure that the manhood of the other man has given me a better defense than precautions could have afforded. Thus the approach to the neighbor should be with confidence in his essential kinship with ourselves, for the sense of this relation is native and deep founded in all men; however overlaid with evil or crime, it is there, and the duty of the true man is to find it.

Those who unhappily lack the capacity for immediate sympathy with the neighbor, — our supercivilization breeds many such, — will do well to practice themselves in studying men. It is a noteworthy fact, one of the mysteries of the commonplace habit of mind, that most people, for all their contacts with their kind, never as observers attend to them. They see them pass in endless procession, but note only those things which have to be seen in order to do

the business of the moment. It is not difficult, if one has a trace of the inquirer's spirit, to change this state of mind, and in its place to develop a keen curiosity concerning the fellow-man. Most of us know that we can become intensely interested in plants or animals, music, bric-a-brac, philosophy, or what not, great or small, so that each feature of our collection will have a personal value. Yet where we find a thousand collectors of objects or impressions in the peripheral fields, we hardly find one who is a collector of men. Now this collecting of men, this study of individuals in the way of the zealous professional student, is the most fascinating and profitable of all the amassing habits which can be formed, for with each specimen that is appropriated the collector as well as the cabinet is definitely enlarged.

The art of observing men is best begun by the study of faces. Very much can be had from the mere contemplation of human countenances, for by this process we may form the practice of noting what is written in the fleeting expressions, or what is deeply concealed by the habits of the mind. Those who would approach the study of their kind by way of these faces will do well to lay a foundation for their work by familiarizing themselves with the countenances of the lower animals. Taking first the head parts of the articulates and the cephalopods,

it may be noted that while there is a certain kind of expression in those shapes, it has no relation to that of man. In all the vertebrates, however, we feel that their heads suggest those of our own kind in a measure somewhat proportionate to their genetic nearness to our genus. From the fish upwards, the likeness of the face to our own increases. In the reptiles and birds it departs from the type that leads towards man. In all of the higher mammals we can see traces of the expression which we commonly believe to be characteristically human. The mother-love for a child, fear, rage, even contempt, are legible to those skilled in reading such inscriptions. In the higher monkeys we may discern nearly all the emotional signs that we find in the faces of the lower men. On this foundation of the geological history of the countenance it is easy to build a systematic study of the human face. Such is the tangle of records on that bit of the body that no one can hope to attain any great skill in interpreting character from what he discerns, but the study, if gone about systematically, will give the intellectual pleasure which always comes from classifying objects. More than that, and nearer to my purpose, it will serve to endear these objects to the observer, and so to give him a basis for the sympathy to which he would not otherwise attain.

With the study of faces should go a like study of voices, for to the skilled ear, and most persons can attain the needed measure of discernment, the voice is even as interesting as the facial record of the mind. Here again it will serve to lay a broad foundation for comparison by noting the history of the voice in the lower stages of life. We find at once that there is no voice in any of the invertebrates. Some crabs click their claws together as a signal to males or foes, and a host of insects rasp out noises, but the true voice made by the breath is found in the vertebrates alone. It is clearly traceable in many fishes and reptiles as an inarticulate sound. It attains a singular range in the birds, but only in the series leading towards man does it show the peculiar human *timbre* or quality. This is singularly developed in the Amphibia through which our succession has passed, for the common bullfrog when frightened will occasionally give forth a sound strangely like the wail of the human infant. When we come to the higher monkeys, the nearest collaterals of man, the tones and modulations are much the same as in our genus. But while the general quality of the voice was determined in the brutal stages of our series, we have in our kind the eminent peculiarity that the tone is about as characteristic of each person as is his countenance. So far

as I have been able to discover, the personal variation in this regard among the lower animals is so small as to be essentially unnoticeable, except in the case of the humanized dog, where a like individual quality is noticeable. There are probably slight differences, such as enable a ewe to know her own lamb by its bleat, but they are very much less than among men. The human notes are most alike in infancy. They begin to be diversified in childhood, but take their full individual stamp at puberty.

It is perhaps worth while incidentally to remark that this feature of personal difference between men is a fair index of the extent to which, as compared with the lower forms, they are individualized. There is no basis for quantitative determinations, but it may, in my opinion, be taken as certain that the modulus of variation in the intellectual features of men is scores of times as great as in the nearest of his brute kindred. Physically, men of the same variety differ more one from the other than do any equally related wild animals; but those variations of form are trifling compared with the diversities of spirit.

It is for each person to seek the best way in which he can form the habit of coming near to the neighbor and to determine the tests of his success. In general the test that is most trustworthy is that

which is afforded by one's state of mind at the moment of contact. If at this moment the self is put aside and the neighbor takes its place then the task is well done. Such is evidently the end towards which the process of sympathy is tending to develop; such is the attainment in the love of the mother for her child, the hero for his cause, or friend for friend. That it is winnable is proved by those seldom experiences of lofty souls which point to the high way of man. It is not to be supposed that it can be readily won, but it is the goal to which life is striving in mankind.

Let us bring this ideal of the neighbor, the actual ideal of the good Samaritan of twenty centuries ago, into our dealings with men. Let the first experiment be with the Israelite for the reason that for two thousand years he has been opprobrious to the folk of our Aryan age in all its civilizations, and may therefore stand as the type of the human shape which most arouses our tribal prejudices, and which will put our bettered understanding to an effective test. We will not take our example from the cultivated modernized member of the race who is so like our own people that analysis is required to show him alien, but rather the ancient "dog of a Jew" who by his face, mien, and phrase almost justifies, in our eyes,

the shame of our ancestors' conduct. If you allow the primitives in you to control, you inevitably revolt against the creature, and are as ready to harry the unfortunate as a thirteenth century Christian. But look at him with an eye that takes account of what lies behind his miserable aspect and behold a transformation. In that rude shape is the vastest accomplishment we know in the universe, a man. He may seem the lowliest of his kind, yet in that same form he laid the moral foundations of our civilizations by work done from one to two hundred generations ago. In his race is the stuff that made Christ and all the men we know as the prophets, and he has for millenniums withstood the tortures of hell to keep his noble faith as his fathers held it. He may be all that his enemies charge, yet there is in him and his kind the most solid substance of a man that the world has ever known. He has worn out the dynasties and empires of his persecutors, and stands ready with the spirit of youth to face whatever the world sends. Look behind that offensive manner, particularly offensive because it happens not to be of our fashion, and you find the faithful, kindly man, the trustworthy citizen, the good father, the far-seeing inquirer, the soul which is the quickest to harmonies. Set all this over against the judgment to which we are led by the instinctive preju-

dice and judge what is the value of such a motive in estimating the quality of the fellow-man.

While any one who knows the history of the Israelitic folk even in outline, and has taken a little pains to find out the general quality of their private life, cannot justify the patently erroneous view to which instinctive prejudice leads men of our race concerning that people, he is likely to take refuge in his instincts, and to comfort himself with the notion that because natural guides they are true; in effect, he thinks that he should loathe a Jew because he is moved to loathe him. The answer to this is plain. It is that where we trust to our instincts for guidance they lead us straightway to shame. The thief, the murderer, in fact any kind of criminal can make this plea in justification of his offense. A nearer instance of the value of this excuse is to be found in the revolt which substantially all people feel at the sight of a mangled human being. This instinctive repulsion extends in many instances to those who are seriously deformed. It is evident that this horror of those who, by their maimed state, have seemingly been dehumanized is of the same order of emotions as that which the sight of the very alien produces. In both cases there is such a contrast between the creature and our notion of the kinsman that it arouses a sense of repulsion. What is our judgment of a

man who trusts his instincts and runs away when he sees a wounded neighbor dying for need of help? Yet the excuse is as rational as is that so often given for avoiding the Jew.

It seems self-evident that the duty of a man is to bring to his contacts with the neighbor all that he has of understanding. There is no other human business that is so important as this intercourse between man and man. A vast deal of what makes for human advance or degradation comes about when for the moment these solitary creatures come into touch. Clearly what is done at those times is eminently the work of the world. In the task which is then before us, vague "instincts," which are generally mere prejudices acting alone, have no right to attention save as they move us to do what we know to be fitting. What we need is the very best which reason and sympathy acting together can provide for the duty.

Turning now to the other instance of race prejudice which immediately concerns us, we will consider the conditions of contact of the African and the Aryan. In this association we find that the prejudice due to the aspect of the alien is apt to be much more decided than it is in the case of the Israelite, for while the Semitic differs from the Aryan in shape of countenance, there is no such unusual mark

•

as betokens the difference at a glance. With the Negro there is in the face, in the character of the hair, and, above all, in the hue of skin something which is in striking contrast with what we are accustomed to take as the rule for men. So far as those features are concerned, the man is the antithesis of ourselves. Such contrasts are naturally, and, in a way, fitly, shocking to those persons who have not become habituated to the differences of men. The disgust is not due to the fact that the Negro has this or that peculiarity of body, but that he, like the maimed or deformed person, violates our ideal of the human form. This ideal, which remains in the subconscious part of the mind along with a host of other ruling concepts, only makes itself known to us when it is pained by some impression that does violence to it. We see a more abstract instance of the same general nature as that above set forth when in a new place we suddenly notice that the sun appears to rise in the West. We then find, what was before unnoticed, that our ideal as to where it should come up is dear to us. Many instances could be cited to show how our concepts of peculiar phenomena, though when philosophically considered they are seen to be mere categories, are in fact intensely real parts of ourselves which may be wounded even as our bodily parts. So it is with all peoples, the sight of another species of their

genus naturally offends them. It is probable that the hatred of the dog for the fox or wolf is of this order, there being enough of likeness in the alien to the creature's ideal of his kind to indicate kinship, and at the same time so much that denies the kinship as to arouse the impulses of race hatred.

There can be no question that so long as the Negro is so unfamiliar that the white beholder has not had a chance to modify his category of human beings so as to include him, he is instinctively offensive. This I was able to prove by an interesting experience. In eastern Kentucky there is an area of about ten thousand square miles with a population of nearly two hundred thousand where Negroes are unknown. Through my camping in this district with my servants, great numbers of people came to have their first sight of a black. From the faces of these people, as well as by questioning, I learned that one and all were painfully startled by the aspect of the creatures. Although these mountain folk were devoted Unionists in the Civil War, and are still generally Republicans, their dislike for the Negroes is so great that they rarely allow any of them to dwell in the district. The result of this is that in parts of the South where the agricultural conditions made slavery unprofitable, the Negro is not often found, and apparently is not likely to be allowed a place among the people.

The same instinctive social dislike which affects the uneducated whites of the southern Appalachian district exists among the cultivated folk of New England. As before noted, a number of persons who sympathize in theory with the blacks on account of their oppressed condition have, in answer to my questions, stated that they experienced a distinct and painful shock on the near approach to them of a member of that race, and that no amount of habituation served to deaden this impression. I have naturally been unable to obtain like good evidence as to the state of mind of Negroes on first seeing a white man, but the accounts of travellers in equatorial Africa clearly suggest that the alarming sense of strangeness at the aspect of the man of the white race is as intense with them as the opposite is with us. It may therefore be assumed that this state of mind is normal and has to be reckoned with in the intercourse between very alien peoples.

In contending against the moral repulsion which the aspect of the person of an alien race makes upon us, we should have sufficient help from our reason, which is able to break down the yet greater dislike with which the deformed or maimed man impresses us. A simple prescription for this disease of the sensibilities may be had from the familiar experience of those who come into contact with such suf-

fering; it is to go at once to the sufferer and lay the helping hand upon him. Let me in this matter once again import my personal experience, which I think is illustrative. It has been my chance to help many wounded men. In all such cases when I first look upon the sufferer I am filled with a disgust which impels me to seek protection in flight. There is, of course, sorrow for the afflicted, but this is overmastered by the intense desire to spare myself the pain due, so far as I can see, to the shock to my ideal of what a man should be. The moment I touch the sufferer all that horror immediately vanishes and he becomes that dear thing, the actual neighbor. The fact seems to be that the impressions of sight have little awakening effect upon the sympathies as compared with those of touch. This appears to be recognized in the mode of greeting by clasp of hand. So too in various ceremonies in which there is a laying on of hands. At any rate, the effect of personal contact with the neighbor who in his suffering revolts us is most indicatively effective. It shows that the need is to get near to him.

It is obviously out of the question for us to greet the stranger by any kind of embrace, but it is important for us to recognize the fact that in merely beholding him we really do not enter to him but remain afar off. We should take this condition into

the difficult reckoning we have to make in our relations with our fellow-man and do what we can to remedy the matter. What we should especially do is to make a thorough study of the way in which we should perform the sacred office of approaching the neighbor, and at the time of meeting keep in mind the obsessing effect of the commonplace spirit which blinds us to the true nature of all human relations not illuminated by love.

It is well attentively to consider the fact that the only human intercourse which does not ordinarily fall at once into the pit of the commonplace is that between lovers or between mother and child. In these relations alone as yet is the spirit of man lifted above the lowly automatic plane, that which he learned to occupy in the prehuman stages of his development. If we note what happens in our usual contacts with the neighbor we perceive that our intercourse is guided by a group of instinctive, organic habits essentially uninfluenced by emotions.

If we watch the behavior of children we may see that certain habits of approaching the neighbor are born in them and are but slowly affected by education. The stranger is to the infant at first an object of suspicion, as he is to the adult. All the training which a lifetime of wholesome experience may give does not eradicate this ancient, inborn instinct of

fear of the alien. The only way in which it can be overcome is by love. We note that in infants this primitive fear of the newly seen person lessens as experience shows that the new shape is not really to be feared; with them, as with the lower animals, it becomes commonplace,—but there is evidently always in the mind the reservation that the stranger, not being friendly, may be inimical. So long as he does not come over-near it may be neglected, yet he has to be watched. The attitude of latent hostility changes only when the new-comer into the child's life gives some evidence of real friendliness which leads it to place him in the category of creatures to be loved. It may be no more, it commonly is no more, than some touch of kindness in expression or in tone which serves the ready instincts of the child and awakens its love. Thus with young children there are but two distinct categories for people; friends and enemies. As they grow to maturity the third, that of indifferent people, who may be consistently disregarded, is formed to include the greater part of mankind.

It is to be observed that the category of commonplace folk is a product of civilization, the result of crowding, and of the safety which the law affords in well-organized societies. In the tribal state the division remains much as it is among children. The new

figure, if not recognized as a tribesman and therefore entitled to affection and confidence, is naturally regarded as an enemy. Nothing but evil is to be expected of him, no faith is owed to him. The idea of any common bond due to the fact that he is a man is, in this state of society, impossible, even though the tribe be of the highest quality of such organizations. A good instance of this is seen in the ancient Jews, where the alien could claim nothing on the score of his humanity. It was, as elsewhere noted, the peculiar work of Christ to insist upon the kinship of all men, and to protest against the tribal motive of his people.

Because the category of the commonplace or indifferent man is relatively new, the usages associated with it are much less well defined than are those related to the other groups. We all know by ancient experience how to treat those we love or those we hate, but as to the method of dealing with those for whom we do not care there is no end of variety. In the old days when an unknown neighbor was to be feared, policy dictated that he should be treated with a propitiative courtesy if of station that indicated that he might be dangerous, or with condescension if his state was evidently much inferior to one's own. But when, with the greater safety of our modern society, the danger or profit to be reckoned

from the stranger has become negligible, he is generally neglected. If we watch the conditions of contact in those places where men are thrown closely together, as on crowded streets, it is easy to perceive that they generally take no note of each other's existence except so far as is necessary to avoid physical accidents. In this condition the fellow-man is no more than a moving object which has to be avoided as one would avoid a rolling stone. While this negatively brutal relation with the neighbor in a throng is necessary, it must be regarded as the greatest of the many evils arising from the crowding of people in those social congestions of our great towns, for it breeds a habit of disregard of the fellow-man. We may manage by sanitary precautions to avoid the bodily dangers which arise from our social congestions, but there is little chance that we shall ever be able to accomplish any betterment of the spiritual ills that it entails.

If we observe what takes place in ourselves when in a throng any one accosts us, we may see a little further into the peculiar state of mind of people in a crowd and note that each is curiously and for defense withdrawn into his cell. Even if the person who addresses us is a well-known friend whom we should have instantly recognized had he been isolated, we are likely to find that we have trouble in

remembering him, we have to work out of our prison before we can really see him. It is indeed evident that except we deliberately and with some difficulty force ourselves into a sympathetic attitude towards those who are driven into contact with us we instinctively seek protection by avoiding all consciousness of their presence. This is a most unwholesome state of mind; one that goes contrary to the primitive human instincts which lead us to take account of every creature that has the shape of our kind, accounting him friend or foe. Even enmity to the neighbor is better than this trained indifference which the conditions of our massed societies induce.

In watching the behavior of a throng of people we readily perceive that there is a very considerable range in the phenomena of contact they severally exhibit. The man from the country who is unaccustomed to adjust himself to the conditions of a crowd retains his instinctive sense of the neighbors: he goes forth to them with merriment or hostility. On the other hand, the townsman keeps himself spiritually aloof even if buffeted in the press. Now and then we may note the curious phenomenon of the mob spirit, which shows us how artificial is the isolation which men may establish in order to protect themselves from their neighbors. If there happen to be some common interest to move them, some

rage or affection that impels them all to the same purpose, the host at once becomes strangely united. It is no longer composed of men who seek isolation, but the units join like raindrops in a current that sweeps them on. This change may take place with wonderful suddenness and bring about very singular results, some of which are of value to our inquiry and need the discussion which I shall now give them.

Observant persons who have been in a crowd when the mob spirit has suddenly developed will probably agree with me as to certain features of those strange contagions of motive. The most evident point is the quickness with which a spirit of association is developed: the movements, however aimless, are made in common, so that the throng, without willing it, acts as a united body. Another less evident but most important feature is that the motives of action are always of a very primitive kind. In the milder instances of the contagion, the common impulse may be affection for a hero such as leads his admirers to carry him on their shoulders. In the more distinctly mob-like action a rude, sportive impulse may be the guide. In the real mob, however, when we mean all that the word implies, the motive is often that of rage which is not satisfied with mere slaying but requires for its gratification the utmost cruelty that

can be invented. The most singular part of the process which develops the mob is that it leads to the immediate overthrow of all those sympathies which characterize the isolated and independently acting men, bringing them, for the time, into the state of the primitive brutes. While possessed of this spirit a body of men or even of women, who acting individually would be fairly merciful, unable even when enraged to torture an enemy, become changed to demons. We see, in a word, that people associated in passionate action constitute a new kind of human being, one that has a primitive animal nature, if so to term it be not injustice to the brutes.

It is characteristic of the mob spirit that it generally endures but for a short time, and, further, that it does not develop except when considerable numbers of persons are associated. The psychological crisis rarely endures for more than a few hours. The longest assault of this nature appears to have been that of the "Terror" of the French Revolution of 1793, when it appears to have continued for some months. In fact the Gallic mind, as is shown by the numerous, long continued attacks of mob-madness, appears to be curiously prone to obstinate and terrible fits of this nature. I am not aware of any instances among the English or Teutonic folk where this crowd-madness has endured as much as a week.

As for the numbers required to afford the conditions suited to the development of the mob spirit it may be said that the throng must be great enough to inspire its members with a sense of power ; the idea of multitude appears necessary for its awakening.

It should be here said that although the mob motive is usually associated with lynchings, it is not necessarily a part of such actions. In many instances of rude frontier justice, where men have been compelled to act in unlawful ways in order to obtain protection against criminals, that action has been in no wise influenced by what I have termed crowd-madness ; it has indeed been distinctly parted from it by the fact that it was judicially conceived, and carried out in the manner of stern men who were in no measure possessed by the torturing spirit which is characteristic of the true mob.

Those who have had a chance to observe people who were possessed of the ancient devil of the mob are likely to have noted that they acquire a singular and uniform expression, their faces have a kind of pinched, staring look, which reminds one of people who are hypnotized. They respond to suggestions in the automatic, insensate manner of hypnosis. It appears to me quite probable that they are in some measure hypnotized and have thereby been brought into a state in which only a part of their

several natures is active and that the lower part. Their look and behavior clearly indicate the state designated of old as "possession," which is now generally recognized as induced by or related to the hypnotic condition.

It appears evident that the phenomena of crowd-madness are by no means limited to what is exhibited by an ordinary mob. In many other ways we see the same impulse due to this state of mind. Thus in an army we may often see the contagion affect large bodies of men who are still under the control of discipline; the greater part of the heroic work of battle as well as its most shameful panics are impelled by this motive. The successful orator commonly effects his end not by an appeal to the intelligence of his audience as individual men; by his art, particularly by the quality of his voice and by certain incantation-like modes of speech, he converts the many into a united whole over which even irrational suggestions will have a great swaying power. Those who have beheld the old-fashioned religious revivals have seen good examples of this hypnotic and suggestive action. An excellent example of the same nature may be found in the political history of this country. In the democratic national convention held in 1896, a clever orator, marvellously endowed with this swaying power, so

moved the delegates to crowd-madness that quite against their judgment they made him their candidate for the presidency. This singular capacity, vulgarly but not inaptly termed "spell binding," enabled that clever rhetorician to retain control of nearly half the voters of the United States for at least five years. History affords many instances of a like captivating power which has enabled its possessors to determine the conduct of men by putting their wits to sleep, but in no other modern example has this curious ability been displayed on so vast a scale among an intelligent people.

The contagion which finds its most intense expression in the ferocity of a mob passes, by insensible gradations, through the admixture of other motives, into fields of action where its existence would hardly be suspected. Thus the movements of what is called public opinion are evidently in large measure affected by the emotions which tend to make men in contact think alike. Although I am not a believer in what is termed thought transference, the experiments on which others rest their belief show clearly the intense and instinctive desire of people to shape their concepts on those of their neighbors. Most men contend against their own native individuality because they hunger for a sympathetic mergence with their kind, and if the

throng hates Jews or Negroes, or adores this or that of art, they must share in the motive. In this we have a lowly, herd-like stage of that sympathy which in its higher estate gives us the best the world affords in the relations of men. In this primitive level its results are mostly evil for the reason that in all forms of crowd-madness, however much they may have of nobility in the impulse which guides in the action, the result has something of the quality of the mob's work. It is irrational, and therefore tends to fall into the plane of the lower motives.

Here the reader may naturally ask whether this condemnation does not extend to all the sympathies which move great masses of folk to common action. Whether, for instance, patriotism in its belligerent expressions does not come under the category of crowd-madnesses. The answer seems to me inevitably clear. It is that all the teachings of experience go to show how social movements determined by sympathies not greatly qualified by reason — so far qualified that they are essentially rational — are necessarily evil. Thus the patriotic motive, provided it rests upon the judgment of a man, may be the noblest that awakens in him, for at its best it embodies more lofty qualities than any other. But where the motive is but the wild spirit of the tribe

which sets up its success in contending with other tribes as the most desirable thing in the world, it is, from the point of view of the enlarged man, essentially ignoble because it is irrational. The patriotism which lifts us in this day is that which considers before it moves; it takes into account many things beside the primitive wild cry that finds expression in such a phrase as "our country, right or wrong," and leads men straight away to do the devil's work in the name of the Lord. It is high time that we should sit down to consider what patriotism really is, so that we may purge it of the mob spirit which now often masquerades under its name. Whoever does this task with reason for his guide will find that his true allegiance is due, not to bits of earth or prejudices of tribes, but to large purposes; to the great movements for the advance of mankind, and to the over-ruling order of this world. If it happens that this enlarged faith leads him away from his people, even makes him seem to the vulgar a traitor, it should not halt his steps. He knows that the day of the tribe is past and that it is his part to act for larger purposes than it embodies.

What we have seen above of the effect of the motives of the throng in the gradations from mere fashion to the crowd-madness of the mob is helpful to our purpose, for it serves to explain certain

features of the complex motives which constitute race hatreds. We best see the application by considering what would happen in case we reared and soundly educated a youth in conditions which would permit him to come into contact with those of alien race without any acquaintance with the prejudices concerning such people which he normally acquires through literature or tradition. Coming, we will suppose, into contact with Jews, this youth would pretty surely note that they differed from his kindred in certain notable ways. Some of these ways would offend him, but he would be accustomed to like offenses from his own kind and would learn, as we all have to, that men are to be taken in sum, their good set against their bad qualities. Against the carnality and greed of the Jew he would set his essential kindliness, untiring industry, and faith that answers faith. By forming a fresh and independent judgment concerning the Semite he would be able to do what men of the Aryan race in twenty-five centuries of intercourse have not done. He would have a chance to escape from the control of tradition which necessarily embodies, along with much that is good, the lowest motives of his people, its rages, hatreds, and other uncleanness,—a chance which is denied the best of us who are soaked in this excretion known as “public opinion.”

The lesson we learn from the study of crowd-madness is that the supreme need in our life is for clean individual thought and action in all that relates to the alien neighbor. We may fairly, and in the main, trust to the tribal state of mind for guidance in all that concerns those who are by birthright near to us, for there the sympathies are so far quickened by training that they act when and as they should; but for all that relates to the remote man, these impulses of the throng, because they were shaped in the ancient, lowly life, are far from helpful, in fact, they hinder our way to right doing. For this new life we need the new light that comes to us through the discerning sight of Christ, and from our larger knowledge of what life means. These show us that we need to deal with our neighbors not, as our inheritances of custom dictate, in the categoric way, but as individuals,—and this because we are individually responsible for the justice and mercy which is the neighbor's due.

What has been set forth in the preceding parts of this book has been presented somewhat diffusely. This matter of human contacts is indeed so vast that any effort to discuss it in an orderly way would have led to a formality of statement which would have defeated the object which I had in view. Yet in order

to attain my end I shall sum up these considerations in this final chapter and try to show how they should affect our relations with the fellow-man.

First let me ask the reader to give over so far as he can the commonplace trivial view of himself which comes from the momentary nature of his self-consciousness, and to see that self as it is now clearly discernible as the most marvellous product of the ages which this world can ever disclose. He should understand that what he holds is the inheritance from incalculably numerous ancestors ; that perhaps a hundred thousand species have helped to build and transmit life to him. Over this store of the past his personal self has control ; not of it all, for the most that goes on in his individuality, both in the body and in the mind, is as unknown to him as though the action were in another planet, but enough is consciously his own to afford the ample resources of joy and duty which it is his privilege to know.

The second point we should attend to is that the foremost duty of man is to take account of what has come to him in the way of inheritance, and to part the evil from the good. The province of moral action consists mainly in this criticism of that which has come to us from the past, and in the rejection of all that does not fit the higher life of man. Whoever does this task faithfully advances towards the higher

stages of existence that open before his kind ; whoever fails of this duty remains in the bondage of the brute and the brutal man.

The third consideration is that the solitary individual man cannot find his life within himself—all but the lowliest part of it is won by friendly relations with his fellows. On the measure of the sympathy which he gives to his kindred depends his fullness as a man ; depends also the station he attains in the higher life towards which, in part by the laws of that life, in part by the action of his will, he is striving. The development of this sympathy in the lower grades of human society has been limited by the physical conditions of men, by the narrowness of the family, and afterwards of the clan or tribe which came from it. Ages ago in all the developed races the stage of the limited tribal sympathies was passed, but the limitation has been maintained by a combination of motives so strong that it has effectively defeated the main purpose of Christ, even among those who regard themselves as his most faithful disciples.

The fourth point is this. Inasmuch as the highest form of religion in the keeping of that race which must be accounted the noblest has, for near two millenniums, signally failed to make head against the tribal motive, or to bring about any distinct ad-

vance in the relation of individual men to each other, we have to consider whether the task has not to be abandoned as beyond human power to accomplish. The answer to be made to this is that we have yet to essay a reinforcement of the sympathetic motive with the vast addition which modern knowledge affords. We have yet to see what the understandings of man can do for his advancement on the ways to which his higher sympathies direct him. It is evident that in certain fields great advances have been made in human relations by the combination of reason and altruistic motives, and this gives us ground to hope that the association is able to accomplish the even more difficult work which is before it. We see that in the system of organized society this association of rationality and impulse has really bettered the relations of man. It is true that this betterment has not gone far in matters which affect the personal relations of man with man; nevertheless, they have broken down the ancient system of tribal rights, and there is no good reason to doubt their ability, with an added measure of rationality, to break down the remainder of the primitive motives such as now shames our civilization and degrades our commonwealths.

If the reader would attempt this method of betterment he should see that the only way to success is

through himself, by the reformation of his own habits of thought and action. Let him in this task face the peculiar difficulties due to the fact that all which can be done has to be effected within his own soul, — wherein lies the most important difference between the betterments of human contacts and the advancement of social or political order. In this latter work we seek to make others do that which we see to be fit; in the former it is ourself we have to compel. Unhappily there is a mighty difference between these two modes of action. Notwithstanding some slight and insecure gains, the most potent influence that has ever come to man in the form of organized sympathy, the Christian religion, has failed to sway man to this domination of himself. It may indeed be reasonably held that we are not much nearer the end than we were at the birth of Christ. There is no use in glossing over the difficulties of this situation or of allowing the sympathies to lead us to such idle hopes of swift conquests as have beguiled the faithful for nineteen centuries. We have to sit down before this ancient stronghold of evil prepared for a hard siege.

The prime need in this endeavor to better our relations with the neighbor is to keep in mind what we know of our human history, and by so doing to restrain the influence of the commonplace state of

mind which leads us to look upon him as an alien. My experience shows me that this task, though by no means easy, is entirely possible. The help will not come by mere knowledge of what the fellow-man really is and what he means to us, knowledge such as I have endeavored to set forth in this writing, for all that of itself is mere information and as such has no compelling power in shaping relations. It has by meditation to be fused with the sympathies, so that it acquires what, for lack of a better word, we may term the religious motive, — that union of the whole spirit in fervent noble desire for the betterment of man, which is the essence of all higher faiths.

Perhaps the most encouraging part of the help which the modern learning can give us in our quest is that relating to the history of the sympathetic bond. When we behold the steadfast way in which, through the ages, the necessarily sundered individuals have steadily tended to unite themselves in the larger whole of societies, and how man is effectively man because of his great advance in this process of union, we feel ourselves on a clearly defined way, which is the easier for this definition. Wherever a man turns in action he finds that he has to push against the walls of obstacles that surround him, — has indeed to hurl himself against them. Here, however, is a place of least resistance,

the barrier yields as an unbarred door, and lets him easily forth into the wide realm where he may with further contention force his way on. I have found that so far as I have been able to fuse what I have of acquired knowledge with the primal sympathies the way has been made easy. The main difficulty is that the understanding came at a time when the barriers of acquired habit reinforced those of an inherited nature, so that the task has been harder than it would have been in youth.

One of the most serious difficulties that those who fare on this way to enlargement have to face arises from the state of our traditions and literature relating to contacts with the neighbor. Although this body of transmittenda is full of nobility, of self-sacrifice, of tender care for fellow-men, in aspirations for their betterment, it is curiously lacking in illustration that relates to contact with the fellow-man and skill in entering to his needs. Those who know in a general way something of literature are likely to recall but few instances of men or deeds in which this side of human action is nobly portrayed. The sayings of Christ, especially the parable of the Good Samaritan, Sidney's "cup of water," and some others less indicative, are all that I recall. Few of them take account of the deep that parts man from man, or of the cry for succor that comes over it as from

the shipwrecked to their comrades for help. The truth is that the effects of the individualizing process on the status of man, the loneliness it brings and the obligation of mutual help that it entails, have not yet entered into our thought. We need the poet and the seer to give this lesson a support that science alone cannot give.

As this matter of bettering the mode of contact of men with men is, from the point we are viewing it, essentially a scientific undertaking, the inquirer would best set about it in the fit manner of an inquirer. It will be well first for him to note, as he may readily do in the endlessly repeated experiment of ordinary life, how far a friendly or sympathetic attitude to the nearest of his neighbors, the members of his household, contributes to his enlargement. In proportion as he goes forth to them sympathetically he feels that he is out of prison, while even a trifling disagreement puts him sensibly in chains. When in his ugly humor the world is valueless, its wealth comes back on the tide of affection. When we observe this phenomenon, as all men have had a chance to do since our genus was evolved, the wonder is that as a mere following of this path of least resistance, and for no more than evident profit, kindness has not become a firmly established habit of man. A little further observation will show that

there is in us the more ancient, and, in its time, profitable habit of self-regarding, a mighty devil which contends against the newer and higher nature we know as the Lord. Thus in the commonest of our experiences we are brought experimentally in contact with the very heart of the great moral problem that we all have to face.

To develop the path of experiment, the inquirer will do well to seek contact with some person belonging to a group which he feels to be far remote from him, for instance, a common laborer. Observing first that this man, because of his aspect, and, more than that, because of the prejudices with which we conceal his visible quality, seems exceedingly remote, the student should proceed to explore him with that open mind which it is the bounden duty of the naturalist to take with him in his work of research. From much experience I can be perfectly sure that the result, provided the exploration is complete, will be a conviction that this particular form of the alien is in all essentials, in all that goes to make a man, a true kinsman. The differences are of no more than atomic weight compared with the planetary mass of likeness. If this task is well done, the discovery of kinship thus attained is fit to be ranked with the greatest that the naturalist's experience can give, and among the most profitable.

The inquirer must not suppose that he can go straight about the exploration of his neighbor which he is here advised to make. The matter, like most profitable inquiries into the unknown, is one of much difficulty, and requires the ingenuity of the true experimenter. The specimen must be caught and kept under conditions which will permit observation. He cannot be captured in a fly net and fixed with a pin in a favorable attitude for study, as some sociologists essay to do. He must be caught in the net of sympathy and explored by friendliness, else it will not be possible to see him clearly enough to make out his likeness to ourselves. This task is difficult enough, but it is one of the most rewarding that can be undertaken. At first sight the reader may be offended at the very idea of cultivating friendly relations with one essentially alien for the deliberate purpose of experiment. I confess that in the statement it does appear revolting. Yet the offense, as will be found in the endeavor, is but fanciful, for the relation at once, and of necessity, becomes perfectly human, differing from other friendships only in the fact that scientific curiosity—a perfectly worthy motive—stands beside the union, noting what makes for wisdom. Of all the host of motives that lead men to come near to one another, this is among the wholesomest. Even if the person

who is thus approached comes in time to know that he was chosen as a subject for inquiry, he will, if he has become friendly with the inquirer, be in no wise troubled. Friendship is an ample mantle that easily covers far worse offenses than this.

Having extended his conceptions of what constitutes a man, by satisfying himself that the most outlying members of his own stock are essentially like himself, the inquirer should then apply the same method of closely sympathetic yet observant contact to some distinctly alien race. History shows with almost appalling certainty that the Jews afford the best, if not the only instance, in which we can readily find contacts on terms of perfect intellectual equality with a very alien people. Judged by the evidence, what we may call the *modulus of alienity* of these people from our own is to be reckoned as greater than in the case of the Chinese, or the American Indians, or indeed any other of the high races. We may be certain that in proportion as the Jew is comprehended, he will exasperate the Aryan, and this feeling will grievously interfere with the inquiry. But if he be a true observer, it will stimulate his curiosity, for he will find himself in the presence of a most interesting subject of inquiry, and will, after the manner of the true naturalist, surely fall in love with the instructive specimen.

If the Hebrew who serves for the inquiry be a characteristic example of his race, the observer will discover that while the former has all the characteristic qualities of the Aryan, each in essentially the same form and in about the same ratio, they work together in a way so different that the effect is baffling. Just here he finds himself upon the track of the explanation as to the dislike of these races for each other. They are near enough alike to suggest an identity of spirit which makes close relations possible, but the differences are such as hinder the two kinds of men from matching their humors in a friendly way. They feel that unhappy condition termed in the law of divorce an "incompatibility of temper" and so hasten apart. The observer may be inclined to abandon the attempt, but, once again, he will, if he be a true inquirer, reckon with his testy humor as he will with his bad eyes or clumsy hand, and set about the task of finding out whether these differences are really such as to prevent friendly association. If his result is what my experience indicates, it will be that, once we give over the instinctive yet insensate demand for the neighbor to be ourself in another skin, and are prepared to make a manly allowance for differences in men, the Jew appears as a very admirable, though in certain instances, perhaps, somewhat disagreeable, species of

our genus. In a word, as soon as we bring into the assemblage of motives which operate in human intercourse the tolerant spirit of inquiry, of catholic appreciation for what the world offers, these variations from what we have been in the habit of considering the normal man, these variations, which, acting on the clumsy wits of common men, have shamed this earth, become little more to us than the differences in the faces of our friends, some of which may offend us though they all are dear.

If the exploration of the Jew is made with care on a number of good examples and in the light of the history of that people, the observer will be likely to come to the conclusion that perhaps they have the right, from the naturalist's point of view, to be regarded as the type or highest species of the genus homo, while we Aryans must content ourselves with the second place in the series. Measured in terms of organic endurance, so well proved by the trials to which our species has subjected them, by the stamping power of their blood, or by their intellectual and moral achievements, they are clearly entitled to this superior station. Against this array of Semitic capacities we can set only the constructive power of our own race as it is manifested in the government-shaping ability, together with the capacity for research into nature and into the me-

chanic arts, in all of which fields the Jew is inferior to the Aryan. The conclusion of the inquirer is likely to be that the Semite is, on the whole, the ablest type of man the world has known, but a type which is somewhat archaic for the reason that its powers are not those most intimately related to the life of the genus in its present stage or in its foreseeable future, because they do not take hold on the natural realm.

If, after studying the peculiarities of the Jew, the student of human nature turns to the Negro, he will find a subject of inquiry no less interesting though very different. He will find that in the Jew we have a singularly fixed type of the highest quality, one so fixed that despite its exceeding range and scope the essential nature is always marked. Moreover, as before noted, the observer has to learn that the Jew has, as one of his most characteristic and unfortunate traits, an eminent incapacity for imitating any other kind of man. In the Negro, on the other hand, the student will find a singularly elusive group in which it is almost impossible to see anything that we can call a type. It is true he may take if he pleases, as is commonly done, the dark skin and woolly hair as criteria, but a little knowledge of anthropology shows that such indices are very

deceptive, for, using them as a basis for classification, we should make a rare hodge-podge of peoples; but if he seeks for race characteristics of the spirit, as our inquiry demands that he should, he is sure to be puzzled. To make the matter more difficult, the people known in this country as Negroes have a curious quality of imitativeness not found in like measure among other folk save the native Africans, and strangely in contrast with the incapacity for imitation characteristic of the Jews. The result is that the inquirer will find that the blacks do not, or rather cannot, easily reveal themselves to us as they really are.

As the observer breaks his way through the difficulties which he will encounter after he has found that the Negro is not an Aryan in a black skin, he discovers the most interesting type of primitive man left in this world, and learns how very good this primitive may be. Perhaps the most notable of the qualities he will perceive is that of devotion to the strong man who is recognized as the overlord. Some of this humor is in all men, even in our own folk, despite all the ages of culture to which they have been subjected, but in the Negro it is primally strong, for the creature cannot grow to his normal state without such support. As a further result of the same quality, he is in a simple way intensely

religious. That ancient sense of peopled spaces, which has been expelled from our kind, abides in him and gives him a life that is denied to us. This religious humor is in all lowly people but slenderly connected with morality, a union which is recent history in our own race, but in the Negroes it is united with the whole life in a way that should make it possible to turn it into that channel. The other primal motives which go to make a man, such as lust, greed, sense of the droll shown in simple humor, are readily discerned. They appear to exist in the Negro with far less relation to each other than in us, so that the man is shaped by his moods and less by interacting motives. The only evident lack is the curiosity which leads to inquiry. As far as we can speak of the Negro as a race it may be said that this impulse hardly exists.

Owing to the fact that the Negroes of this country are a confused jumble of many varieties of what in the fullness of knowledge may have to be regarded as several distinct races, the study leaves on the observer no such distinct categoric impression as does the inquiry into the Jews. Some of the many Negro types afford specimens which in essential human quality are fit to be classed with the best this world affords. Other stocks are distinctly brutal, so low, indeed, that they are not the material for the uses

of civilization, but should be rejected as incapable of improvement by any resources which we yet know. The commonest elements which the observer will find in this exceedingly varied folk are the tendency to adhere to any masterful man with whom they come into contact, and a fondness for music of such simple order as fits to songs or to the dance. These motives, combined with enduring bodies and with a willingness to labor, will convince the inquirer that he is in contact with a folk who can be turned to good account in a commonwealth.

Perhaps the most interesting result gained from a close study of the Negro, or even from mere intimate contact with his kind, is a curious affection for them. So far as I can find, this feeling apparently does not in the same degree spring from relations with any other alien stocks; certainly it does not come in like measure from any which are so essentially alien to us. Nothing of this nature develops from an acquaintance with the distinctly alien Jews, with American Indians, or with Chinese, though in all those folk we find qualities far more akin to our own. The reason for this difference probably is to be found in the very strong, though unconscious, desire of the Negro to shape himself on the masterful race, and the lack of any such close-knit, stubborn race-character as we find in other peoples. This feature

makes them the most domesticable of all the lowly stocks, for it gives them a sure way to the hearts of all sympathetic persons who come to know them.

When the observer has compassed the quality of two or three diverse kinds of men, he will, if he have a trace of the naturalist in him, become addicted to such inquiries. There is indeed no field of research which so opens the way to largeness of understanding as this, for in it we find not only the satisfaction of scientific curiosity, but also a quickening of the human sympathies such as is denied the student elsewhere in the realm. It has the charm of history with the added pleasure of having the living text before our eyes. At the same time, while the study of diverse races is, in the largest measure, helpful in clearing away the instinctive prejudices, it is well that the inquirer should not limit himself to the diversities of stock alone. He should also learn something of the variety that exists in his own race. One of the most unhappy results of the segregating action of a high social order is that men commonly know only those who are of about their own grade. They would be larger if they sought the chance to make acquaintance with the whole gamut of their folk, those who are in the prisons as well as those in the palaces. In fact, a man remains shamefully ignorant,

famed though he may be for learning, if he has not such a range and scope of knowledge concerning his people. Personally I value what I have been so fortunate as to gain of acquaintance with very diverse sorts of men more highly than all else that I have won in the way of knowledge. Such will be the conclusion to which the inquirer who faithfully seeks to know mankind will surely come, for he will find that the lessons help him further on the path of duty than any other this good world affords.

Nothing so well shows the obsessing effect of the commonplace as the neglect of all deliberate study of men. Psychologists inquire into their mental parts, romancers seek from them situations, now and then some melancholy Jacques looks a bit into their sad ways, but not one in a million of us tries to see what these most interesting of all things are. I have known many students, but never one who gave any considerable part of his powers to the study of men in their human quality with a view to seeing the measure of their diversities and their fitness for the work of the commonwealth. We cannot perhaps hope to see any considerable results from such study, though, fortunately, it does not need to go far in order to win the end in view. As soon as we begin to take men in the way of inquiry the old brutal attitude towards them disappears. Habit will

lead to many fallings from the grace it brings, but the fact that it is a relapse into the old iniquity will be at once evident, and they will occur no oftener than the other assaults of the devil upon a truly moral man. To him there will be no more a "dog of a Jew" or a "damned nigger" or other accursed shapes of men, but each with its measure of nobility will go to make up the splendor of the world. So far from the diversity being exasperating, as it necessarily was in the tribal state of mind, it becomes in this view an enrichment of existence. We are no longer limited to one quality of the wine of life, we come to know and to love all its vintages.

To apply this to the question of race contacts in this country we should see that the most important feature of the American commonwealth consists in the intimate mixture in its society of exceedingly diverse races. Other states have had a like variety of men within their bounds, but in those instances the various peoples have been geographically segregated so that the interaction has been between masses of folk, each keeping something like a tribal isolation. Where, as in certain of the European states, they were blended in a common life, the various kinds have, with rare exceptions, been of the same race. In those instances where by chance of conquest diverse stocks have been brought into con-

tact, as with the Moors in Spain and the Jews in many fields, there has been continuous trouble, generally resulting in the expulsion of the weaker folk. It is, in a word, evident that in this country we are, at the price of our national life, to accomplish the task, which historically seems impossible, of merging all these discrepant elements in a close-knit society. The question is, how can it be done?

It is evident that it is a condition precedent to any success in the American problem of government, based as it is on a great human complex, that our people quickly and effectively rid themselves of tribal prejudices so that they can face their task with reason, sternly, as needs be, yet with understanding and sympathy for the folk who are committed to their hands. Taking the large view of the situation, it appears that the first step should be to minimize this task by not allowing it to become any greater than it now is. The ways to this limitation are evident. They are to avoid additions of trouble through immigration and through the annexation of countries peopled by folk of alien stocks. As for the limitation of resort to this country, it should be so contrived that it may keep out those varieties of men who are proved by their history to be unfit for the service of our state. It would take us too far afield to discuss this limitation in detail, but it is

If the Hebrew who serves for the inquiry be a characteristic example of his race, the observer will discover that while the former has all the characteristic qualities of the Aryan, each in essentially the same form and in about the same ratio, they work together in a way so different that the effect is baffling. Just here he finds himself upon the track of the explanation as to the dislike of these races for each other. They are near enough alike to suggest an identity of spirit which makes close relations possible, but the differences are such as hinder the two kinds of men from matching their humors in a friendly way. They feel that unhappy condition termed in the law of divorce an "incompatibility of temper" and so hasten apart. The observer may be inclined to abandon the attempt, but, once again, he will, if he be a true inquirer, reckon with his testy humor as he will with his bad eyes or clumsy hand, and set about the task of finding out whether these differences are really such as to prevent friendly association. If his result is what my experience indicates, it will be that, once we give over the instinctive yet insensate demand for the neighbor to be ourself in another skin, and are prepared to make a manly allowance for differences in men, the Jew appears as a very admirable, though in certain instances, perhaps, somewhat disagreeable, species of

our genus. In a word, as soon as we bring into the assemblage of motives which operate in human intercourse the tolerant spirit of inquiry, of catholic appreciation for what the world offers, these variations from what we have been in the habit of considering the normal man, these variations, which, acting on the clumsy wits of common men, have shamed this earth, become little more to us than the differences in the faces of our friends, some of which may offend us though they all are dear.

If the exploration of the Jew is made with care on a number of good examples and in the light of the history of that people, the observer will be likely to come to the conclusion that perhaps they have the right, from the naturalist's point of view, to be regarded as the type or highest species of the genus homo, while we Aryans must content ourselves with the second place in the series. Measured in terms of organic endurance, so well proved by the trials to which our species has subjected them, by the stamping power of their blood, or by their intellectual and moral achievements, they are clearly entitled to this superior station. Against this array of Semitic capacities we can set only the constructive power of our own race as it is manifested in the government-shaping ability, together with the capacity for research into nature and into the me-

have to be faced. The first is that these Africans are ineradicably alien, in that it is not possible to unite their blood with that of our race. The results of centuries of experiment show beyond all question that this union cannot be effected without the loss of the qualities which give our Aryan race its singular value. The conditions demand that the blood of the races be kept entirely apart. Such is clearly the judgment we have to make even in face of the fact that some able men have arisen who are of the mixed race. The next point seems to me even as clear; the body of our African people, though fit for the simpler duties of citizenship, are not yet fit for the task of government, for which indeed, as the experience of ages shows, few peoples even of our own race are suited. It is unhappily evident that the presence of this unenfranchisable folk will make it necessary to limit the suffrage within a large part of this country in a way that would not otherwise be necessary, in a way that is in itself very undesirable. The right to vote will have to rest on education or on the possession of property; or, perhaps, it will be expedient to require both these qualifications.

By the adoption of the qualification of education no new principle will be introduced into our system, for it rests on the assumption that the citizen is a

literate person, and the requirement of proof is in accordance with this theory. Moreover, this is already the law in some of the states of this Union. The institution of a property qualification would be a return to a system which was general in the early days of this country. It was abandoned without much consideration, partly from the conviction, then not unreasonable, that the electorate body would be trustworthy, even if those on the verge of pauperism were admitted to it. There can be no question that there are great evils attendant on the possession of the franchise by some millions of our people who have given no evidence of fitness for citizenship and who are not at all subject to taxation. Taking a rational view of the state, it may in the main fairly be regarded as a corporation for the management of property, so that the right to vote logically inheres in the stockholders, and not in those who incidentally share in the advantages it affords. A state is else than a corporation, but that else is, with the advance in the general social order, steadily becoming less important. Except we hold to the ancient preposterous notion that a *male* human at one and twenty years of age suddenly becomes endowed with a right to share in ruling the commonwealth, we can see no right that could be infringed by a requirement that the voter should prove either that

he earns a fair wage or holds a certain amount of property. On these accounts it does not seem a serious breach with our traditions to limit the suffrage in the manner in which it evidently has to be limited in order to exclude so much of the essentially alien population of this country, Negro and other, as is necessary to insure its safety. We may regret the change, but cannot regard it as in any way breaking with our most valuable traditions.

While a limitation of the suffrage by educational or property qualification or both may not be harmful, may even be advantageous, any system which makes it depend upon race would be in the highest manner destructive to our institutions. It would strike at the heart of the principle of equal opportunity for equal talent which is the organic centre of our commonwealth. Therefore while I am in favor of the changes in the constitutions of the Southern States which have limited the franchise, I regard the purpose of disfranchising the ignorant Negroes, while leaving the equally ignorant whites still in possession of the suffrage, as so far a restoration of the tribal system which it has been the task of our commonwealth to overthrow. As for the miserable subterfuge commonly known as the "grandfather clause," by which this end was accomplished, I am ashamed that it should have been invented by Americans.

Although the people of the late slaveholding states have, in the difficult situation due to the presence of the freedmen, made some serious blunders, still there is good reason to hope that they will soon find the way to a satisfactory adjustment of the relations of the two races. We may found this hope on the fact that the people of this part of the country have a rare capacity for the tasks of government. That part of the stock which is from the original Southern Colonies, especially from Virginia, has shown more genius and devotion in such work than any other people. The history of slavery in these states indicates that in general the whites understand the Negro and are able to win his devotion in a measure not found elsewhere. For a generation there has been much confusion, as was to be expected as a consequence of the very great social revolution due to the Civil War and to the emancipation of the slaves; but when the history of these conditions comes to be written, the marvel will be that, taken as a whole, the social and public order of the country has been so well preserved. Not only has there been no approach to a war of races, but the economic condition has steadily and swiftly bettered, until at the present time the district which thirty-five years ago was the most impoverished ever occupied by an English people is perhaps the most pros-

perous of its fields. This alone proves the organizing capacity of the Southern folk, and affords a happy augury for their future management of the great problem.

To obtain the full value of the Negroes to the commonwealth, it is necessary to shape action in reference to them with a clear understanding of the diversity of their nature due to the very great variety of stocks and even of races which exists among them. It is my conviction, based on much study of the black people, that a considerable part of them will be found very well fitted for the more serious duties of citizenship, and that with fit help in education and incentive somewhere near half of them can be uplifted to a plane where they will contribute to the quality of the state. Of the remainder, the most that can be hoped is that they will make useful laborers. In this lower group there is a remnant, probably not five per cent of the whole black population, which retains so much of the primitive brute that it cannot be turned to account. It is from this very small part of the folk that comes the class of outrages which constitute the real menace of the situation. It is doubtful if the proportion of this primitively brutal element of the Negro population exceeds much, if at all, the corresponding degenerate and otherwise base material in the whites,

but it seems probable that it is more inclined to crimes against the person, particularly to assaults on women. Naturally these atrocities excite rage, but this is too often visited unreasonably on the unoffending body of the blacks, who, if in close social contact with the whites, are, as is well proved by the history of the people in slavery, no more given to such offenses than those of our own race. It would be quite as reasonable to condemn the English stock for the offenses of its criminals as to condemn the Negroes as a whole for such crimes, which probably do not occur in one in ten thousand of that people, and in only the lowest part of the very mixed stock. Here, as in our own race, this class of malefactors should be weeded out. There is good reason why assailants of women should receive the highest punishment of the law,—that they may not propagate their kind; but there is no reason whatever for allowing these miscreants to prejudice our conduct towards a valuable body of folk who are akin to them only in the color of their skins. It may be said, however, that the Southern people have never shown any general disposition to take this course.

The Southern people may be trusted to find the value of the Negro in his new condition as they did in the old. They recognize that in this vigorous,

very human folk, they have a supply of labor which is absolutely necessary in fields which do not tempt white people. They know, or must learn, that the value of this population can be had only by developing and suitably promoting those of the blacks who show themselves fit for advancement. There is no other way open to us except to trust the future of the Negro to the white people with whom he is in contact. All the expedients of the reconstruction period resulted in hindering the advance of the work it was intended to accomplish, for the reason that it set the races over against each other; it broke up the old friendly relation which had effaced the most serious of the tribal prejudices, and set those persons in flame. Any further effort to force an adjustment will be likely to result in something like race war. That we best trust, and may fairly trust, to the South to contrive safety and justice out of the situation has happily become evident to the whole people. By putting the burden on those who are best fitted to bear it we shall sooner and more surely bring them to deal with it in the manner in which men of our race are accustomed to deal with grave social problems — painstakingly and with justice.

INDEX

INDEX

- ABNORMALITY of stranger offensive, 165.
- Affection, basis in mental quality, 29.
- Alien, lack of rights of, 42 ; impossibility of profitable subjugation, 59. See also, Stranger.
- Animal independence, 249.
- Assaults on women by Negroes, 148. See also, "outrages" by Negroes, 334.
- Associative action among men, 247.
- Atomic field, groupings of units in, 3.
- Atoms, changes of, 1, 3, 4.
- Auto da fé*, 99.
- Automatic action, 16.
- Autonomic motive and American Union, 66.
- Banneker, 151, 163, 178.
- Beavers, constructive habits of, 244.
- Blood relationship and religion, 266.
- British government in India, 70.
- Brute qualities, early appearance of in man, 236.
- Care of offspring, effect of on survival of, 24.
- Categoric motive, 134 ; in animals, 192 ; in man, 193.
- Categoric view, replaced by sympathetic, 201.
- Categories, necessity of revision of, 197 ; revision of, through affection, 200 ; broken down by knowledge, 221 ; modification of, to include Negroes, 291.
- Cherokee alphabet, 61.
- Christ and the tribal spirit, 274.
- Commonwealth, ideal of, 54.
- Communism, mental, in animals, 246.
- Consanguinity, significance of, 267.
- Contact, with the neighbor, way of bettering, 218, 314 ; not to be gained through science, 221 ; manner of, and attitude toward the neighbor, 229.
- Contacts, human, effect of speech and clothing on, 36.
- Coöperation, imitative, in vertebrates, 244.
- Cross-breeding, effects of, 160 ; effects on Negro, 162. See also, Inter-marriage and Miscegenation.
- Crowd-madness, in armies, 302 ; lesson from, 307.
- Crowd motive, evolution of, 253. See also, Mob and Throng.
- Cruel motive essentially human, 234.
- Cruelty, of Spanish, 91 ; of French, 96 ; tendency to, deep-founded, 233 ; natural selection and, 235.
- Cruelty motive, lessening of among Germanic peoples, 230.
- Crusades, 94.
- Darwinian and LaMarckian hypotheses, 253.
- Dead, contact with, 31.
- Democracy, ideal of, 180.
- Difference, importance of, 49.
- Duty of man, 261, 308.
- Educational and property qualifications for voters, 331.
- Emotions and categorizing, 196.
- English modification of Roman rule, 55.
- Ethnic barriers, broken by Mahometanism, 45 ; failure of Christianity to break, 46.
- Ethnic group, bonds of, 41.
- Ethnic motive, in primitive tribe, 43 ; obduracy of, 50 ; in political development, 54 ; treatment of by Roman method, 55 ; intensity of, in Jews, 65 ; value of, 69 ; result of failure to understand it, 71.
- Experience, inherited, 4, 16.
- Experiment, value of, in understanding man, 315.

- Family, basis in ideal of kinship, 47; origin of affection for, 265.
- Feralizing of domestic animals, 249.
- Field-mice, constructive habits of, 245.
- Future, mammals which make provision for, 61.
- Gallio, 53.
- Gesture language primal, 216.
- Hatred, in lower animals, 21; modified by reason, 22; result of, 23; modified by sympathy, 23; escape from, 260; tribal, and commercial intercourse, 269.
- Hayti, Negroes in, see Negroes.
- Hebrew, see Jews.
- Identification with community, desire of individual for, 258.
- Immigration, limitation of, 327.
- Incapacity of primitive folk to endure toil, 61.
- India, success of British in, 70.
- Indians, success in civilizing, 59; toiling capacity of, 62; productive activity, 63; relation to tribe, 68; social prejudice against, 197; dances symbolic, 212.
- Individual, separation of, from his fellows, 204, 271; influence of common mind on, 256.
- Individual quality of man, summit of a series, 204.
- Individuals, as source of influence, 9; grades of solitary condition of, 36.
- Inheritances of man, 261, 308.
- Inherited experience, 4; lessening of, 16.
- Inherited quality, organic features of, 4.
- Insects, social habits of, 238.
- Instincts, meaning of, 243.
- Instinctive action, 16.
- Instinctive coöperation in vertebrates, 244.
- Intellect and evolution, 8.
- Intelligence, definition of, 10; result of introduction of, 11; primal and rational in man, 19.
- Intermarriage, of Negroes with whites, laws relating to, 164, 176, 328; undesirability of Negroes with Aryans, 330. See also, Miscegenation and Cross-breeding.
- Jewish persecutions, origin of, 104.
- Jews, intensity of religion of, 65; Greek and Latin authors on, 72; agriculture of, 75; causes of misfortunes of, 77; Roman conquest of, 78; Greek comments upon, 78; early dislike of, 82; Roman authors on, 83; attitude of Christian Europe towards, 88; entrance into northern Europe, 89; capacity for finance, 91; as money-lenders, 92; expulsion of, from Spain, 92; outbreaks against, in France, 93, 96; outbreaks against, in England, 95; affected by Renaissance, 98; amelioration of condition of, in Germany, 99; legal emancipation of, in France, 100; social station of, 102; religious motive in social status of, 106; Aryan feeling of repulsion for, 108; the world's ablest folk, 116, 237; physical aspect of, 116; desire for profit, 118; not skillful actors, 120, 321; inability to adapt themselves to neighbor, 121.
- Kazans, 89.
- LaMarckian and Darwinian hypotheses, 253.
- Language, purpose of, 206.
- Lessing, 100.
- Lethal quality of man, 233.
- Love in human relations, 294.
- Love of both parents for offspring, 26.
- Love, of males for offspring, 263; for the community, 264; mother's, see Mother-love.
- Lynch law in South, 150, 188; mob spirit in, 301.
- Maimed persons, instinctive horror of, 288.
- Man, dynamic value of, 7; nervous system in, 17; motives of lower animals, 18; categoric motives in, 193; individual quality of, 204; lethal quality of, 233; early appearance of brute qualities in, 236; inheritances of, 261, 308; duty of, 261, 308; value of sympathy to, 309; value of experiment in understanding, 315.
- Mediæval type of state, 53.
- Mendelssohn, 100.
- Mental isolation, effect of, on evolution of species, 251.
- Mental understanding in animals, 246.
- Metayer system, 175.
- Militant spirit, development of, 53.
- Militant type of insects, 18.

- Mind, animal, variability of, 254.
 Miscegenation, results of, 60. See also, Intermarriage and Cross-breeding.
 Mob-spirit, in animals, 253; endurance of, 300; hypnotism and, 301. See also, Crowd and Throng.
 Modification of motives with bodily changes, 248.
 Monogamic habit, development of, 25.
 Moral life, origin of, 252.
 Moral truths, a part of natural learning, 277.
 Mother-love of offspring, in lower vertebrates, 26; developed by touch, 34; evidence of, 283.
 Motive, ethnic, see Ethnic motive.
 Motive of tribe, see Tribal motive.
 Motives in man, 18.
 Motives, need of understanding natural history of, 259.
 Natural selection, effect of, on labor habit, 62; theory of, in accounting for cruelty in man, 235.
 Negroes, capacity to endure work, 62, 127, 132, 133 note; death rate of, 131; ability to acquire English language, 133; lack of historic sense, 135; in Hayti, 137; slight sense of political order, 139, 157, 191; business incapacity, 139; development of sympathies, 140; faithfulness of, 141, 321; disinclined to drunkenness, 147; assaults by, 148, 335; incapacity for invention, 152; aptitude for languages, 153; æsthetic capacity, 153; disenfranchisement of, 158, 166, 181, 330; and the professions, 167; savings banks for, 170; social barriers against, 176; in public office, 182; federal legislation for, 189; ability to adapt themselves to neighbor, 121; violate ideal of man, 290; dependence of on higher race, 321, 323; value to the commonwealth, 334.
 Neighbor, seeking of ourselves in, 40; importance of manner of meeting with, 114.
 Nervous system in man, 17; of vertebrates, 14.
 Offspring, care of, 24.
 Organic and inorganic groups of individuals, difference between, 3, 10, 227, 236.
 Patriotism, is it crowd-madness? 304.
 Personality seen in other person our own, 28.
 Political ideal, development of, 52.
 Primal impulses, 34.
 Primitive folk, incapacity to endure toil, 61.
 Race problem, 253, 329.
 Race war, possibility of, 336.
 Rationality and instinctive motive, 18.
 Religion, truly gained by sympathy, 202; breaks down categories, 223; where ineffective, 269; and science, 275; failure of, against tribal motive, 309, 312.
 Reproduction and sympathy, 262.
 Roman method of rule, 55, 57; its ideal imperial control, 58.
 Roman system, estimates of, 58.
 Science and religion, relation of, 275.
 Selection, artificial, effect of, 250.
 Sequoia, 61.
 Skepticism, its relation to the Reformation and to science, 98.
 Species, origin of, 247; definition of, 252.
 Specific motive in animals, 253.
 State, controlling motive of, 257; concept of, 268.
 Stranger, entering on relations with, 29; an object of suspicion, 39; mental demand made on, 38. See also, Alien.
 Studying of men, value of, 281.
 Subjugation of aliens on other than Roman plan, 59.
 Suffering, effect of, on sympathies, 35.
 Suspicion, importance of putting away of, 279.
 Sympathetic way of approach, 225.
 Sympathy, evolution of, 18, 20, 263; tribal, 26; towards the sufferer, 32; limited by language, 37; communication of, by bodily movement, 211; primal organic necessity, 257; value of, to man, 309.
 Tabu, 212.
 "Terror" supremely human, 233.
 Throng, behavior of, 298. See also, Crowd and Mob.
 Tribal habit inherited, 52.
 Tribal ideal, permanence of, 66.
 Tribal motive, extinction of, in America, 44; barrier to civilization, 48; endurance of, 68; betterment of, 266.
 Tribal spirit harmful, 46.

- Tribe, evolution of, 255 ; oldest social feature of mankind, 52.
- Unclassified objects, fear of, illustrated, 30.
- Unit, mankind as, 66.
- Unknown neighbor, treatment of, 296.
- Variation, moral significance of, 236 ; effect of coöperation on, 254.
- Vertebrate animals, success of, 12.
- Vertebrate group, 11.
- Vertebrates, peculiarities of, 13.
- Vertebrates, structural features of, 14.
- Village Improvement Association, 172.
- Words, of little value in arousing sympathy, 209, 213.

The Riverside Press

*Electrotyped and printed by H. O. Houghton & Co.
Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.*

Boston Public Library



3 9999 10503 481 1

